DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 655 CS 213 612

AUTHOR	Mol, Anne Marie
TITLE	A Comparative Case Study of Implementation of Writing as a Process.
PUB DATE	Aug 92
NOTE	180p.; M. Ed. Project, University of British Columbia (Canada).
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; College English; *English Curriculum; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Program Development; *Program Implementation; Secondary Education; *Writing Instruction; *Writing Processes
IDENTIFIERS	British Columbia; Process Approach (Writing)

ABSTRACT

Implementation of a new program is a complex process of putting ideas into action. Program implementation can be characterized through the identification of interrelated factors which determine the success or failure of implementation of an innovation. Writing as a process has been perceived as a successful teaching methodology for many years, but a number of factors impact on the implementation of writing as a process and determine whether or not it will receive safe passage into the classroom. A comparative case study investigated the process of implementation by examining the factors which helped or hindered the implementation of writing as a process. The implementation of the process writing methodology was undertaken by eight teachers of secondary English who attended writing workshops. The subjects were then divided into two groups, one considered to have successfully implemented the program, the other not successful. Data were collected through interviews and questionnaires. The factors identified as influencing the implementation processes were: (1) district support; (2) perceived need; (3) beliefs; (4) teacher knowledge; (5) teacher interaction; and (6) ongoing inservice. District support was concluded to be the major factor distinguishing the successful implementers from the non-successful ones. All of these interrelated factors affected implementation of writing as a process through their interaction in intricate systems of circumstances and characteristics. (Forty-six references are attached; various documents used for the research are appended.) (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352655

A COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF WRITING AS A PROCESS

By

Anne Marie Mol

B.A., Simon Fraser University, 1981

A MAJOR ESSAY SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF EDUCATION

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

We accept this major essay as conforming
to the required standard

J. Belanger

F. E. Bertram

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

August 1992

CS213612

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Anne Marie Mol

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Implementation, the 'how' of change, is a complex, multidimensional process of putting ideas into action. One method of characterizing implementation is through the identification of interrelated factors which, through their interaction in a given situation, determine the success or failure of implementation of an innovation (Fullan, 1982).

Since the 1970s writing as a process has been perceived as a successful teaching methodology for improving student writing. Many workshops have been provided for teachers interested in learning about and using this approach in their classrooms. However, a number of factors impact on the implementation of writing as a process and determine whether or not it will receive safe passage into the classroom.

This comparative case study investigates the process of implementation by examining the factors which helped/hindered the implementation of writing as a process undertaken by eight teachers of secondary English who attended writing workshops. The research subjects were divided into two groups. One group was considered to have implemented writing as a process and the other group was considered not to have implemented writing as a process. The methodology included a questionnaire and teacher interviews. Data were examined for similarities within each group, and then the two groups were compared for differences. The data were analyzed for factors which affected implementation and the factors were described in context of how they helped/hindered implementation of writing as a process.

The following factors were identified as influencing the implementation processes of the teachers who participated in this study: 1) district support, 2) perceived need, 3) beliefs, 4) teacher knowledge, 5) teacher interaction, and 6) ongoing inservice. The major factor which distinguished the implementers and non-implementers was district support which was also implicit in many of the other factors. These interrelated factors affected implementation of writing as a process through their interaction in intricate systems of circumstances and characteristics.

4 Questionnaire and Interview--Findings 42
  A. Teaching of Writing Before 43
  B. Perceived Need for Change 51
  C. The Writing Workshop 55
    1. Year and Duration of Workshop Attended 56
    2. Effect of the Workshop 56
  D. Interaction and Support 60
  E. Teacher Awareness and Use of the Characteristics of the Innovation 66
    1. Writing Strategies 66
      a. Writing Strategies Implementers and Non-Implementers Aware of 67
      b. Sources of Writing Strategies 69
      c. Level of Use of Writing Strategies 72
      d. Student Reaction 78
      e. Suitability of Writing Strategies for Certain Grades and Writing Assignments 81
    2. Expansion of Audience 84
    3. Writing Conferences 86
    4. Writing Assignments 87
  F. Teaching of Writing After 89
  G. Personal Background Experience 95
  H. Summary 98

5 Conclusion 102
  A. Observed Factors Affecting Implementation 102
    1. District Support 103
    2. Perceived Need 104
    3. Beliefs 104
    4. Teacher Interaction 107
    5. Teacher Knowledge 108
    6. Ongoing Inservice 110
  B. Summary 111
  C. Limitations of the Study 112
  D. Recommendations for Further Study 112
  E. Signifcance of the Study 114

Bibliography 116

Table of Contents

Abstract ii
List of Tables vii
List of Figures viii
Acknowledgement ix

1 The Problem 1
  A. The Background of the Problem 3
  B. The University of British Columbia Department Language Education Writing Workshops 9
  C. Purpose of the Study 11
  D. Limitations of the Study 11
  E. Significance of the Study 12

2 Literature Review 14
  A. Writing as a Process 14
    1. Description 14
    2. Writing as a Process Program 19
  B. Implementation and Writing as a Process 22
  C. Impementation 28
    1. Factors Affecting Implementation 28
    2. The Role of Belief 33
  D. Summary 34

3 Methodology 36
  A. Research Subjects 36
  B. Development and Administration of Questionnaire 37
    1. Development 37
    2. Administration 38
  C. Development and Administration of Interview Guide 38
    1. Development 38
    2. Administration 39
  D. Method of Data Analysis 40

Appendices

A. Department of Language Edcuation Writing Workshop Outlines 121
B. Cover Letter Sample and Questionnaire 124
C. Questionnaire Before Revisions 140
D. Interview Guide 145
E. Transcript Sample 147
F. Detailed Tables of Questionnaire Results 166

List of Tables

Tables:

1. Workshop: Year Attended and Duration 56
2. Post-Workshop Interaction 60
3. Type of Support Received From Various Sources After Workshop 62
4. Number of Writing Strategies Both Groups Aware 68
5. Where Writing Strategies Learned 70
6. Level of Use of Writing Strategies 72
7. Student Reaction 79
8. Suitability of Writing Strategies for Grade 82
9. Suitability of Writing Strategies for Assignment 83
10. Frequency of Types of Writing Assignments 88
11. Specific Prewriting Strategies Both Groups Aware of and Where Learned. 166
12 Specific Drafting Strategies Both Groups Aware of and Where Learned 167
13. Specific Revision Strategies Both Groups Aware of and Where Learned 167
14. Writing Strategies For Which Both Groups Required More Information 168
15. Level of Use of Prewriting Strategies 169
16. Level of Use of Drafting Strategies 170
17. Level of Use of Revision Strategies 170

List of Figures

Figures:

1. The Principal Features of the Traditional and the New Paradigm of Teaching Writing 16
2. Schedule of Interviews 40

Acknowledgement

Certain people have been instrumental in ensuring that this major paper came to be and should be thanked:

- My advisor, Dr. Joe Belanger, who provided me with the idea for this study and kept me going with his support, helping hand, and insightful guidance. Thank you, Joe, it has truly been a learning and rewarding experience.
- The teachers who gave of their time to participate in this study. I appreciate their candour, humour, and professionalism.
- William Roper, my district's superintendent, who encouraged me to enter graduate studies and would take the time to enquire about my progress.
- Frank Bertram who generously gave his assistance.
- Dr. David Bateson who would come visiting to the islands to go "fishing with Timmy" and check on me. Thank you, Dave, for your helpful suggestions, gentle push and for reminding me of what it is all about.
- Tim Wolthers, my confidant, my sweetheart, and my husband, who listened to me long into the night (and pretended to after midnight). Thank you, Tim, for your faith and confidence in me. I look forward to spending our summers together again.

Chapter 1

The Problem

Introduction

There is an ongoing concern for improving writing programs which is manifested in both research and theory development. These, in turn, influence the practice of program planning and strategies used in teaching. Traditionally, the focus of writing instruction has been on the written product. However, with the shift of emphasis and concern in research from the written product to the process of composing that product, a new approach to teaching writing has emerged -- writing as a process. Since the 1970's, writing as a process has received wide recognition, examination and support.

Although favourable endorsement by educational professionals and proven results from students are necessary, they are not sufficient in themselves to guarantee that writing as a process will receive safe passage into the classroom. There is the concern that this approach, like so many other new innovations introduced to schools, will have its brief moment in the light before fading away into obscurity (Glatthorn, 1982). However, understanding of why programs in general fail or succeed has grown. Fullan (1982) points out:

> Remarkably, it is only in the last twelve years (since about 1970) that we have come to understand how educational change works in practice. In the 1960s educators were busy developing and introducing reforms. In the 1970s they were busy failing at putting them into practice. Out of this rather costly endeavor (psychologically and financially) has come a

> strong base of evidence about how and why educational reform fails or succeeds. (p. 5)

Recent literature concerned with educational change indicates that the results of attempts at change hinge on how the change is carried out (Fullan, 1991; Huberman & Miles, 1984; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978). Implementation, the 'how' of change, is a complex, multidimensional process of "putting into practice an idea, program, or set of activities new to people attempting or expected to change" (Fullan, 1982, p. 54). It is multidimensional in that putting an innovation into practice may require changes to various aspects such as materials, pedagogical approaches, and beliefs and values if an innovation's desired effects are to be achieved. (Fullan, 1982).

As implementation occurs at the user or teacher level, it is not surprising that the teacher has been found to be the key factor in the implementation process. For implementation strategies to be effective they need to take into account "where teachers are; that is how and why they think as they do" (Sarason, 1982, p. 232). Implementation strategies must be based on knowledge "of the naturally existing mechanisms which operate in school environments" (Doyle & Ponder, 1977-78, p. 1). They also must consider how and why teachers make decisions about their classroom instruction (Leithwood & MacDonald, 1981). The critical role of the teacher adds to the complexity of the implementation process. As Werner (1987) points out:

> . . . in reality this equation (someone imposes change on someone else) is much more complex because the final gatekeeper and interpreter of change is the teacher. His or her decisions and actions are the essence of implementation; programs-in-use are shaped by such things as the teacher's discussion partners, value conflicts,

> educational assumptions, resource negotiations, time compromises, decision trade-offs, and even forms of resistance. (p. 41)

Since implementation is a process (not an event) by which teachers develop new ways of thinking and acting, it may take a number of years for change to occur (Fullan, 1991). One method for characterizing this seemingly simple yet elusive concept "involves identifying a list of key factors associated with implementation success, such as the nature of the innovation, the roles of the principal, the district role, and so on" (Fullan, 1991, p. 67). The success or failure of implementation of innovations depends upon the interaction of these factors in a given situation.

According to Fullan, a number of factors impact on the initiation of writing as a process into the classroom and determine whether or not this approach to the teaching of writing will be institutionalized.

The study reported here surveyed eight teachers of secondary school English with regard to their experiences in implementing writing as a process into their classrooms. The focus of this study is the exploration of factors which might be considered to have helped or hindered implementation of writing as a process.

A. Background of the Problem

Until the 1970s, most studies of writing were primarily concerned with some aspect of the written product. According to Freedman, Dyson, Flower & Chafe (1987), "researchers lacking a theory of how writing developed compared the effectiveness of a variety of ad hoc instructional methods or concentrated on how best to evaluate the final product" (p. 1). However, during the 1970s, a shift in focus occurred. Concern for product was replaced with the concern for the writing process. Hillocks (1986) states that this shift was influenced by the published work of Braddock, Lloyd-Jones & Schoer in 1963. Researchers followed a number of their suggestions, but perhaps the most significant question Braddock et al. posed for research was, "What is involved in the act of writing?" (p. 53).

In attempting to answer this question, Janet Emig (1971) influenced research methods through the development of the case-study approach and think-aloud protocol and shifted "the research emphasis from the written product to the writing process" (Freedman et al., 1987, p.15). Not only did Emig influence the direction and methods of future research, but her studies were also capable of influencing educators' decisions about writing instruction. Freedman et al. note "Emig learned that excellent twelfth-grade students found school-assigned writing generally unengaging; they spent little time planning what they would say and less time revising it. In essence, school writing was a well-learned, fairly routinized, mechanical activity" (p. 16).

In attempting to understand how writers compose, some researchers generated models of the writing process. Hayes and Flower (1983) theorize that "writing consists of distinct processes, writing processes are highly embedded, writing is goal directed and writing stimulates the discovery of new goals" (p. 208). They also state that there are three main processes employed during the act of composing: (1) planning, which includes a range of activities necessary before actually putting words to paper (generating, organizing, goal setting), (2) translating, which is the act of expressing in written words the outcome of planning, and (3) reviewing, which is the act of evaluating and if an assessment is unfavourable, revision may occur. Often these processes alternate and their manifestations will be of varying durations depending on the particular writing task at hand.

From the research understandings of a writing process approach emerged, which Hillocks (1986) equates with the natural process mode in his meta-analysis of different classroom approaches (Freedman et al., 1987). Hillocks characterizes the natural process mode as:

> (1) generalized objectives, e.g., to increase fluency and skill in writing;
> (2) free writing about whatever interests the student, either in a journal or as a way of "exploring a subject";
> (3) writing for audiences of peers;
> (4) generally positive feedback from peers;
> (5) opportunities to revise and rework writing; and
> (6) high levels of interaction among students. (p. 119)

In his meta-analysis Hillocks outlines nine studies which he categorizes as using this natural process mode. Of these nine studies, the following three are particularly worthy of note: The New Jersey Writing Project conducted by Alloway et al. (1979) at grades 7 through 12 and two Writing Project assessments, one conducted by Olson and DiStefano (1980) at grades 7, 8, 9 and the other conducted by Wagner, Zemelman and Malone-Trout (1981) at grades 1 through 12. All three examined similar methods of instruction that generally included: (1) use of prewriting activities; (2) students read and commented on each others' work; (3) free writing was encouraged; (4) feedback occurred frequently; (5) not all writing was graded and grading occurred after a written piece had been revised; and (6) students wrote for different audiences and various genres were employed. It is interesting to note that these three studies which use this 'natural process mode' not only showed that students who were taught writing according to this approach improved in their writing, but also documented the probable effects of the similar methods by which teachers were trained in the use of this approach.

The researchers in these three studies realized that the improvements in writing instruction would entail the retraining of classroom teachers. Daniels and Zemelman (1985) report:

> teachers who were given the opportunity to write, to share their work with colleagues, to study recent composition theory and research, to reexamine their own classroom practice, and to develop their own plans for improved instruction would become more effective teachers (p. 3).

Alloway et al. (1979) provide valuable information on how their teachers were trained. Training began with a three-week, sixty-hour summer institute. At first, writing was "self-sponsored" but later "writing was also initiated by other stimuli" (p. 4). The participants wrote in a variety of genres "creating pieces of different lengths, for different purposes with different audiences in mind" (p. 5). They also recorded in journals "their individual responses to the dimensions of the writing process: prewriting, planning, starting, stopping, reformulating" (p. 5). The hour following the writing was spent in small group sharing in which participants read their work to their peers who reacted orally and in writing. Participants also met individually with the institute's instructor at this time for guidance in their work. After sharing sessions, participants were given the opportunity either to revise their work or to start over. Participants not only explored their own writing processes and written work; they were also given the opportunity to teach a lesson "using a proven writing technique and afterwards the theoretic basis of the presentation was analyzed within the context of the writing process" (p. 5). At the end of the three weeks, each participant received a copy of an anthology made up of one piece of writing from each of the participants.

After the summer institute, the participants implemented writing as a process in their classrooms on an individual basis. Each teacher "generally modeled the institute by following the same ratio of time that had been spent in the institute, writing, sharing, and studying theory in their classrooms" (p. 5). In general, students kept journals, peer evaluation and teacher consultation occurred, teachers wrote with their students, and teachers incorporated writing into all aspects of the English curriculum.

The findings of these three studies are favourable. All conclude that their method of training teachers and the use of writing as a process approach resulted in improved student writing:

> . . . the investigators conclude that there were substantial, significant differences in the performance of student writers and that those differences seem logically attributable to the in-service program provided through the Colorado Writing Project. (Olson & DiStefano, 1980, p. 76)

> To conclude, the NJWP is seen to be an effective curricular intervention in the development of writing skills. (Alloway et al., 1979, p. 12)

However, there was the recognition that even though teacher workshops concerned with writing as a process did have beneficial results, more was required for successful implementation of this writing approach. Daniels and Zemelman (1985) maintain that "factors crucial to success include strong administrative backing and committed teachers who serve as facilitators and models for other teachers" (p. 209), and if change was mandated from central administrative sources it was effective "only when teachers were given adequate training and resources plus latitude to implement the program in their own classroom" (p. 209).

Writing as a process has been impacting, and is continuing to impact on the teaching of writing in British Columbia. Educators have used the knowledge generated by researchers and theorists to construct writing programs based on the process approach. For example, the Composition 11 Curriculum Guide and Resource Book (1982), published by the British Columbia Ministry of Education, illustrates how teachers can plan a curriculum based on the writing process approach. Teachers are advised to guide students through the various phases of the writing process. The guide identifies the phases as follows:

> 1. PREWRITING: selection and composition of material into a unified and sensible draft based on appropriate format.
> 2. DRAFTING: generation of ideas and material; consideration of purpose, audience and situation.
> 3. REVISION: PHASE ONE -- Reformulation of draft to make it both more complete and more effective. This should include consideration of possible reorganizations and additions as well as deletions and substitutions.
> 4. REVISION: PHASE TWO -- Editing for conformity, with appropriate conventions of format, usage, grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc.
> 5. "PUBLICATION" of polished work and distribution to readers. This phase will involve reader reaction and/or EVALUATION which, in turn, will result in appropriate "targets" for improvement in subsequent writing. These "targets" will provide part of the MOTIVATION for the next piece of writing. Thus the process becomes circular. (p. 29)

B. The University of British Columbia Department of Language of Education Writing Workshops

In order to address educators' desires for improved writing programs, the University of British Columbia Department of Language Education conducted fifteen writing workshops between 1979 and 1984. Most workshops were held on campus, though some did take place within school districts. According to the information brochure "Intensive Workshops for Practising Teachers", written and distributed by the Department of Language Education, the writing workshops were "based on the principle that teachers of composition must experience the various stages of the writing process themselves." Participants were required to draft, revise, and edit a piece of writing. The workshops varied in length from a one-day "introduction to the composing process for school administrators" to a three-day "abbreviated" workshop, but the normal pattern was a five-day workshop. The five-day workshop not only included the composing process (heuristics/invention, drafting, assessing, revising and presenting) but also covered such topics as writing to learn, grammar and composition, writing in various subject areas, writing for ESL, writing for examination, elements and strategies of forms, technical writing, and assessment and evaluation (see Appendix A for workshop outlines).

The aim of the workshop was "to translate recent theory and research into classroom practice" and was conducted using a practical, hands-on approach in which participants tried everything that was discussed. For example, a number of writing assignments were presented to the participants which were "designed to provide students guided opportunities to explore various aspects of their own world" (Belanger, 1987, p.2). The participants would then choose and do one of these assignments.

In 1984, Frank Bertram conducted a survey to examine workshop participants' reactions to what they had learned at the workshop. The last question on the survey centred on their overall reactions to the workshop. Their responses were quite favourable. Many felt the workshop had provided valuable insights, had been a rewarding experience, and that what had been learned in the workshop was applicable in the classroom. The following is a small sample of the responses given by the workshop participants:

> I came because I was interested in teaching writing. I was following an old model which was to assign more writing. Of course the more writing I assigned the less social life I had, because that model of teacher assign, student write, teacher mark, means that I have to take it all home. The cycle was self-defeating. The teacher marked the rough draft! For many students it was an exercise in failure. I stressed expository writing because I thought it was the language of learning. As a direct result of the workshop I began to write myself. As a matter of fact, the workshop was the first time that I had written anything other than at university. Since the focus of the workshop was looking at the process I began to see that much of what I had understood about writing was true, but much of it wasn't. The shift was from examining the product, to being more directly involved in the whole process. My classes took on quite a different structure.
>
> It supported me. It gave me the idea that other people were doing what I had hoped to achieve. I had been heavily into grammar. . . . I think I learned there that kids can write, and you must let them be free to express themselves. I still don't think we can throw the grammar out . . . but there's a point where you have to say, "Write, Kids, write." Now I'm

> consciously having them do pre-writing and talking with one another about their subjects and so forth.
>
> In this district the influence has been tremendous. ... it seems to me that we changed our whole approach to writing and there have been far reaching effects.

However, not all teachers who attended the writing workshops implemented writing as a process. A faculty member of the Department of Language Education, who was involved in the workshops, observed teachers who had participated in the workshops in their classrooms. From his observations, he concluded that some teachers did implement writing as a process and others did not. From this finding the question arose, why were some teachers able to implement writing as a process and others were not?

C. Purpose of the Study

This study surveyed, through a questionnaire and teacher interviews, eight high school English teachers who attended the University of British Columbia Department of Language Education's writing workshops with regard to their experiences in implementing writing as a process into their classrooms. The purpose of this study centred on the following question:

What are some of the factors that can be observed to help and/or hinder implementation of writing as a process undertaken by eight high school English teachers?

D. Limitations

The major limitation of this study is the sampling technique. It focuses only on the implementation of writing as process as undertaken by eight selected teachers. Teacher selection was based on the following criteria:

- participation in the writing workshops conducted by the Department of Language Education
- were considered to be either implementers or non-implementers by a Department of Language Education faculty member who knew them in various professional capacities
- availability, and willingness to participate in this study.

The four teachers considered implementers were from one school district, whereas, the four non-implementers were from other school districts.

A second limitation is in data collection methods. A questionnaire and teacher interviews, the data collection methods used, asked the teachers to recall events that occurred a number of years ago which, of course, limits the scope of the data collected.

E. Significance of the Study

This study is important for several reasons. Much has been said about implementation and writing as a process separately, but little has been written about implementation of writing as a process. What literature there is concerning implementation of writing as a process tends to be site specific, and focuses on characteristics commonly used. Little has been said about the actual use of this innovation in the classroom and the reasons underlying actual use. This study demonstrates the complexity of the implementation process and highlights some of the observed factors that impacted on the initiation of writing as a process into the classroom. This study adds too the continued dialogue on implementation through the comparison of the examples of implementation illustrated in this study with other implementation experiences. This study may also provide guidance to workshop leaders in addressing implementation concerns of writing as a process.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes what writing as a process is and examines how the theory of writing as a process can be put into practice. The second section discusses the literature concerned with implementation of writing as a process. Finally, the last section describes factors which have been shown to affect implementation.

A. Writing as a Process

1. Description

In order to understand the complexity of change which may be required of some teachers implementing writing as a process, it is necessary to be aware of the characteristics of writing as a process, and how it differs from current, traditional practices.

Writing as a process is an approach to the teaching of writing. Unlike traditional approaches which emphasize analysis and correction of the written product, writing as a process methodology emphasizes understanding and assists students in developing the process of writing[1]. Writing as a process is based on a conceptual model or paradigm which has been evolving since the mid 1960's. In order to determine what is involved in taking a writing as a process approach to the teaching of writing it is necessary to understand both the emerging paradigm upon which it is based, and the traditional paradigm of writing instruction.

---

[1] For more through descriptions of writing as a process programs see Atwell (1987); Daniels & Zemelman (1985); Graves (1983); and Hillocks (1984).

In her article, "Winds of Change", Hairston (1982) presents the principal features of the traditional paradigm and of the new paradigm for teaching writing. As Hairston points out, the new paradigm accommodates the new knowledge generated by research concerned with writers' composing processes. Figure 1 is a summary of the features presented in Hairston's article. In order to highlight the differences between the two paradigms, features dealing with similar content have been juxtaposed.

Writing as a process programs will vary from classroom to classroom. This is to be expected since teachers need to take into consideration the "experience, skill and confidence of their student writers" (Clifford, 1981, p. 51) when planning and adjusting their writing program. However, when the features of this new paradigm are translated into classroom practice, certain characteristics will be recognized in the various writing programs offered by teachers who have implemented this approach. Some of the characteristics are:

1. Instruction is focused on the writing process. This means that not only are students initiated into the same process that writers go through in a manner that allows them to experience the stages (prewriting, drafting, revision) in a conscious, orderly way (Murray, 1968; Shaughnessy, 1977), but also, the teacher is prepared to intervene in the students' writing processes with suggestions of useful strategies to help the students overcome difficulties

Figure 1
The Principal Features of the Traditional and the New Paradigm of Teaching Writing (adapted from Hairston, 1982)

Traditional Paradigm	**New Paradigm**
- belief that the composing process is linear, that it proceeds systematically from prewriting to writing to rewriting	- writing is viewed as recursive rather than as a linear process; pre-writing, writing, and revision are activities that overlap and intertwine
- composed product is emphasized	- focuses on the writing process; teachers intervene in student's writing during the process
- expository writing is stressed	- includes a variety of writing modes, expressive as well as expository
- posits an unchanging reality which is independent of the writer and which all writers are expected to describe in the same way regardless of the rhetorical situation	- rhetorically based; audience, purpose and occasion figure prominently in the assignment of writing tasks
- neglects invention almost entirely	- teaches strategies for invention and discovery; teachers help students to generate content and discover purpose
- strong concern with usage and makes style the most important element in writing	- teachers evaluate the written product by how well it fulfills the writer's intention and meets the audience's needs
- based on belief that competent writers know what they are going to say before they begin to write; thus their most important task when they are preparing to write is finding a form into which to organize their content	- it is holistic; views writing as an activity that involves the intuitive and non-rational as well as the rational facilities; emphasizes that writing is a way of learning and developing as well as a communication skill
- writing is viewed as a mysterious, creative activity that cannot be categorized or analyzed	- views writing as a disciplined, creative activity that can be analyzed and described; its practitioners believe that writing can be taught
	- it is informed by other disciplines, especially cognitive psychology and linguistics, and is based on linguistic and composing process research
	- stresses that writing teachers should be people who write

encountered in each of the stages. The idea is to help students gain control of their writing processes.

2. The assigned writing tasks allow and/or encourage students to write in a variety of modes besides expository writing. This characteristic is based on the understanding that not only do people use many different kinds of writings, but also these different writings require different processes (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985).
3. Audience, purpose, and occasion are important aspects in the writing assignments, and the writing is evaluated by how well it "meets the audience needs" as well as "fulfills the writer's intention" (Hairston, 1982, p. 86). Odell, Goswami, and Herrington (1987) point out "that a writer's purpose and knowledge of audience and subject shape the stylistic and substantive choices the writer makes" (p. 222). They also suggest that this knowledge is tacit; "that is, having derived it through repeated experience, writers can use it without having to formulate it consciously each time they write" (p. 222-223). Yet, as students advance into the higher grades, "the range of assigned purposes and audiences for school writing narrows steadily" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p. 118). However, the problem is, for writing as a process to be in place in the way it is intended, how wide should the audience be? If the idea is to help students "relate to a larger community" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p.118), then it can be assumed that, at the minimum, readership would extend beyond the teacher and that writing topics would be directed to sources other than the teacher (for example, students could be asked to research an ecological problem in their area and than write to their M.P. expressing their concerns).

4. Writing conferences occur between teacher and students as well as between students. Writing conferences provide students with "immediate, meaningful responses to their writing" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p. 161). Although, "teachers at all levels complain about the lack of time for individual conferences with students" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p. 161), Graves (1983), demonstrates that much can be accomplished in a short period of time with one student while other students continue in their writing. However, there is added value when writing conferences occur between students. According to Bruffee (cited in Clifford, 1981, p. 40), "students learned to write better if they were helping each other rather than working alone or with a teacher." Daniels and Zemelman (1985) offer these other benefits to be obtained from student-student conferences:

   > . . . also increases students' sense of responsibility, rather than leaving evaluation and change wholly for the teacher to orchestrate. It provides a real audience of other students who need not just listen passively to the performance. Rather, critiquing groups can make writing part of a genuine dialogue among students about their topics. (p.164)

5. The main role of the teacher is as a facilitator. Since instructional emphasis is on the writing process, the teacher can help initiate this process through imagination, and, with empathy and support, sustain the student's writing process (Emig, 1971). As a facilitator, the teacher no longer focuses just on error in the product, but is free to respond to a number of facets of student writing. Such

facets would include:

- an understanding and interested response to what the writer is saying;
- recognition of improvements from previous compositions;
- discussion of possible goals for personal development in writing (Belanger, 1985, p. 85)

2. Writing as a Process Program

An example of a program using writing as a process approach to the teaching of writing is demonstrated in Clifford's (1981) study in which the method of collaborative composing was developed. This method blends process strategies with a collaborative pedagogy. Collaborative composing entails the elongating and slowing down of the composing sequence (composing, drafting, and revision) into discrete phases. Clifford maintains that by "focusing their attention on these expanded prewriting, writing, and revision stages in the classroom, writers can experience how meaning evolves as they reshape, refocus, and revise" (p. 40). To reinforce the emphasis on process "a supportive, interactive environment" (p. 40) was created based on a collaborative philosophy. According to this philosophy, the teacher would see his/her role as that of a facilitator arranging optimum learning conditions for students. Students would work and help each other, rather than work alone or just with the teacher. In addition, the classroom would be arranged in the manner of a workshop.

In this study, college freshmen students were divided into six classes. Half the classes received the experimental sequence which used the collaborative composing method and the other half received the control sequence in which class time was spent in ways consistent with the traditional paradigm. Both groups received the same assignment sequence of narrative autobiography, description and letters, and finally persuasion and exposition.

The following is a simplified overview of the instructional strategies used in Clifford's study for the experimental sequence. This overview demonstrates what a writing as a process approach can look like in a classroom. The experimental sequence was comprised of seven steps:

1. Brainstorming: After the assignment sheet was distributed, the class was engaged in oral brainstorming, and exploration of possible approaches.
2. Freewriting: Students freewrote in response to the assignment.
3. Small group interaction: Students were divided into small groups of six. They listened and responded to each others' writings. A feedback sheet provided guidance for feedback. Responses included reactions to the content, as well as suggestions concerning what to stress, to delete, and the ordering of ideas.
4. Summary: Each student gave a brief report to the class on tentative plans for his/her writing (i.e., focus, organization, points worth making).
5. Zero draft: Students wrote their first draft and made copies for each member in their group for the next class. Writers read their drafts while others read the writer's draft.
6. Small group response: More specific feedback sheets were used for group discussion focusing on various aspects of writing (i.e., sentences, organization, support, sentence structure, syntax, paragraph patterns and structure). The areas of focus would change

as the term progressed. Toward the end of the semester, the class was solicited for criteria to be used in evaluation of student writings.

7. After reader response (in writing), the essays were returned to the writers and groups exchanged their work for evaluation. Students read each others' work and filled out evaluation sheets which indicated strong and weak areas and gave suggestions for revision.

Additional class time was spent in a workshop manner. Students with specific concerns were matched "with others with a grasp of the problem" (p. 43). For recurring problems, some students were asked to develop mini-lessons. Throughout the experimental sequence, instructors acted as consultants and facilitators "explaining concepts to small groups, working one-on-one, and matching students with complementary strengths and weaknesses" (p. 43). The instructors would also, on various occasions, assume a position in one of the groups and go through the entire sequence modelling "how a good learner behaves" (p. 43). Students did not meet individually with their instructor for conferences. Rather, conferences, in which students discussed their cumulative folders with their instructor, were conducted in a small group setting.

Students who received this writing as a process approach to the teaching of writing made significantly greater gains in their writing performance than students who received the traditional approach. Clifford's study also demonstrated that despite the hours spent on the study of the principles of grammar, the control classes did no better on reducing the number of errors on their posttest writing samples than the experimental group which received indirect instruction. This, finding is congruent with the long and explicit literature on the failure of formal grammar lessons to improve writing (Clifford, 1981).

There are two notable aspects to Clifford's investigation. First, this study demonstrates that an effective process-oriented pedagogy is a collaborative one. In other words, a writing as a process approach is capable not only of encouraging the writing process, but also of affecting performance if the instructional strategies used are based on a collaborative pedagogy. For example, Clifford cites a number of benefits to student writing which occur when students interact in small groups rather than work in isolation or just with a teacher:

> . . . students in the collaborative group were required to give conscious, analytical attention to their own recurring patterns of confusion and to make the necessary adjustments. . . . The small groups provided a conducive environment for these changes by offering multiple responses soon after crucial linguistic and rhetorical choices were made. This feedback from an immediate, socially appropriate audience also seems to have provided a more compelling impetus to change than the abstract grade rewards typical of the current-traditional paradigm. (p. 50)

Second, this study not only demonstrates that the features of the new paradigm can be translated into a constructive, workable, and effective classroom practice which meets the time and assignment constraints inherent in the classroom, but also, how this can be done.

B. Implementation and Writing as a Process

Even though writing as a process has proven to be effective, there are a number of reasons why it has not been "universally adopted by teachers" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p.14). It would appear that a number of problems common to the implementation of many innovations also apply to implementation of writing as a process. Allan Glatthorn

(1982) examines the interest in teaching of writing "against a general background of the research on educational change" (p. 2). He attributes failure of implementation to a number of administrative shortcomings such as: lack of systematic teacher inservice, inadequate funding for materials, introduction of a new writing program without sufficient attention to the rest of the English curriculum, and "the absense of monitoring and feedback mechanisms" (p.6) to ensure all is well after a period of time. Glatthorn suggests implementation of writing as a process should include among its goals "cooperative leadership from principals and supervisors, careful diagnosis of problems in writing, a long term plan for writing improvement, staff development and active involvement of all teachers" (p. 1). However, whereas Glatthorn is correct in pointing out that the role played by administrators is important, there are other aspects of the implementation process which also need to be considered. Some of these aspects are: the nature of writing as a process, the place of writing in the English curriculum, the nature of schooling, and what it is to be a teacher.

According to Daniels and Zemelman (1985), the customary teacher/student relationship of "teacher tells, instructs, gives rules, and the student listens, absorbs, and complies" (p.14) is ill-suited to the collaborative nature of writing as a process which implies "that students learn by doing, practicing and being coached by their instructor" (p. 14). Applebee (1984) suggests teachers need to "shift from a position of knowing what the students' responses should be, to a less secure position in which there are no clear right or wrong answers" (p. 187). Yet, to bring about a change in teacher/student relationship is difficult since the customary role of the teacher has a long history, is entrenched in other school purposes (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985), and such a change can be perceived by some teachers as threatening (Applebee, 1984).

A second problem encountered in implementation of writing as a process concerns teacher expertise. Since teachers lack training in teaching writing methods they "emphasize what they do know about: elementary teachers concentrate on reading and high school teachers stress the interpretation of literature" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p. 15). Student writing is often assigned for testing comprehension or literature interpretation and writing instruction "consists of delivering grammatical terminology and rhetorical regulations" (p. 15) instead of "student-centered, largely inductive, teacher-as-coach process" (p. 15). Since writing as a process is oriented towards "work in progress and the development of new skills" (Applebee, 1984, p. 187) rather than just evaluative tasks, its introduction is "more complicated than simply the substitution of a new approach for an earlier alternative" (p. 187).

The third problem relates to teacher-human nature. That is, teachers, like most people, are reluctant to change (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985). Not only can a promising change be threatening in that it "touches upon basic habits, attitudes, and behaviors" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p.15), but also a change may require much time and effort from the teacher with no guarantee that the cost will be rewarded in student improvement (Doyle & Ponder, 1977-78).

The way in which writing as a process can be conceptualized "as a series of activities or steps in the writing process" (Applebee, 1984, p. 189) poses yet another implementation problem. Teachers who subscribe to such an understanding have a tendency to substitute process activities for skill activities since their main concern is to have students go through a process of following a set of procedures (planning, drafting, revising). Daniels and Zemelman (1985) provide an example of what can happen when writing as a process is improperly conceptualized:

> . . . a high school teacher became interested in peer critiquing and developed a guide-sheet for students to use in responding to each other's work. Now, one of the major functions of peer editing groups is to create a wider audience for students' writing, so that the work acquires more communicative purpose. True, the groups can also be used to encourage correctness, to increase practice in proofreading, and to make copyediting feel constructive. But this teacher's guide-sheet listed only mechanical and grammatical features of the writing, implying to students that communication with a wider audience was in fact not a valued goal in the class. Needless to say, the omission of any content-centered response categories from the guide-sheet quite accurately reflected the teacher's ambivalence about peer critiquing itself, as well as about the "process model" of writing instruction in general. (p. 16).

The National Writing Project network which is "comprised of more than 100 affiliated sites" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p. 3) in the United States is seen as avoiding or overcoming implementation problems "because it is teacher centered" (Glatthorn, 1982, p. 1). "All of these assorted projects have shared certain common assumptions about writing and about teacher education -- though each group has retained a strong local flavor, administrative autonomy, and plenty of charming quirks" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p. 3). The major common goal "of improving student writing by improving the teaching of writing" (Alloway et al., 1979, p. 4) is achieved through basically the same technique as described by Olson and DiStefano (1980):

> . . . selecting teachers who are of proven competence in teaching and composition, bringing them together with other strong teachers and consultants for an intensive summer training program, and then providing them as consultants to schools which desire to improve their composition instruction programs (p. 69).

The training programs are based on the assumptions:

> . . . that teachers who were given the opportunity to write, to share their work with colleagues, to study recent composition theory and research, to reexamine their own classroom practice, and to develop their own plans for improved instruction would become more effective writing teachers. (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p. 3)

Daniels and Zemelman maintain these assumptions are correct. In their book, A Writing Project: Training Teachers of Composition from Kindergarten to College, Daniels and Zemelman (1985) "illuminate the common beliefs and procedures of writing projects by offering a detailed description of one program" (p. 3). They maintain that not only did students of teachers who participated in the Illinois Writing Project improve their writing, but that teacher behavior was affected and that the effects of training persisted long after the workshop was attended:

> In a survey of teachers who had participated in the Bay Area Project from one to four years previously (so that for many, the workshops were several years in the past) the Carnegie study found that:
>
> A large majority of teachers (over 90 percent) indicated that the BAWP experience was of some use to them in the teaching of writing.

> . . . Moreover, the effects of BAWP do not seem to diminish over time even though many teachers do not have ongoing exposure to BAWP. Teachers attending early workshops and in-services are just as enthusiastic about the program as teachers reached by BAWP more recently. (pp. 215-216)

It would appear that the National Writing Projects, by focusing on the teacher, offered an effective program for ensuring implementation of writing as a process.

However, it is interesting to note that what literature there is concerning implementation of writing as a process concentrates on the efforts of the National Writing Projects and tends to be site specific rather than teacher specific. Information concerning how much change actually took place or what exactly was implemented is limited and generalized. Only two studies were found to mention what was implemented in the classroom, and these studies tended to describe only general characteristics. For example, Daniels and Zemelman (1985) claim widely adopted techniques were:

> 1 Prewriting, i.e., activities to help students discover, gather, and organize what to say before drafting.
> 2 Linking personal and formal writing, particularly through journal writing, to increase fluency and enliven the writing school requires.
> 3 Establishing real audiences, to motivate and to provide feedback that shows students the effect of their writing on others; this includes the teacher's becoming a more supportive audience, rather than just a critical one, intervening early in the process as well as assessing the final product.
> 4 Small group sharing and critiquing, to increase student responsibility, develop trust and sense of audience, and stimulate revision without increasing teachers' paper-grading loads.

Although there is the recognition that problems which would affect implementation do exist (i.e., fitting of writing as a process with the English curriculum, clarity of the program, and conflicting beliefs), Daniels and Zemelman suggest that the way their teacher training program is structured and led helps to resolve these problems:

> These writing activities and the learning processes they initiate go a long way toward dealing with the many layers of resistance which members of the group may feel. Yet an effective facilitator is more than an arranger of opportunities; he must also take active steps to meet and channel resistance, to help participants work through the doubts, frustrations, conflicts, and blockages which inevitably occur as the planned activities unfold. (p. 21)

However, little is said about what happened when these teachers went back to the classroom, such as the difficulties which were encountered and how they were overcome. The question also arises, were all teachers who took part in the training program able to implement writing as a process, and, if not, why were some unable to implement this writing approach?

C. Implementation

1. Factors Affecting Implementation

In his book, The Meaning of Educational Change, Fullan (1982) has "attempted to compile the best of theory and practice including many very recent unpublished sources, in order to explain why change works as it does and what would have to be done to improve our success rate" (p. xi). He demonstrates that a number of factors need to be considered when implementing an innovation, and that in order to understand why a program has or has not been implemented also entails the consideration of these factors. He identifies fifteen factors, which, through their interaction in a given situation, affect implementation. As Fullan points out, "the more factors supporting implementation, the more change in practice will be accomplished" (p. 56). The following is Fullan's list of factors affecting implementation:

Factors Affecting Implementation

A. Characteristics of the Change

1. Need and relevance of the change
2. Clarity
3. Complexity
4. Quality and practicality of program (materials etc.)

B. Characteristics at the School District Level

5. The history of innovative attempts
6. The adoption process
7. Central administrative support and involvement
8. Staff development (in-service) and participation
9. Time-line and information system (evaluation)
10. Board and community characteristics

C. Characteristics at the School Level

11. The principal
12. Teacher-teacher relations
13. Teacher characteristics and orientations

D. Characteristics External to the Local System

14. Role of government
15. External assistance (p.56)

Though this list is "all inclusive" it is "simplified" in that each factor contains several variables which can be "unpacked." Fullan provides a few examples of "unpacking" variables contained within a factor:

> For example, "staff development and participation" encompasses several variables which characterize effective staff development and participatory involvement in the implementation process. Or in order to say that the principal can have significant impact on implementation, it is necessary to describe what he or she actually does which influences change. (p. 56)

According to Fullan (1982) these four categories of factors need to be considered when describing educational change as a general phenomenon. However, if one were to examine a particular change, adjustments would be made depending on the unit of interest. For example, "if we were examining small-scale change within an individual school, we would treat the information system, staff development, and such as school-level variables" (p. 56) instead of at the district level where the chart, as it stands, places these factors.

The following brief overview of Fullan's findings concerning the factors which affect educational change will focus on the first three categories.

The first category deals with the nature of the change itself. For implementation to be effective, specific needs, which teachers perceive as relevant, must be addressed. In addressing specific needs, the innovation should have identifiable features so that teachers are clear as to what they will be doing differently. "Complexity refers to the difficulty and extent of change required of the individuals responsible for implementation" (p. 58). Complex changes may be difficult to implement, but they are capable of accomplishing more than simple changes. However, as Fullan stresses, "they must be done in a way which maximizes clarity (through defining specific components and implementing them incrementally)" (p. 59). Finally, the last (but by no means the least) factor in this category concerns "the quality and practicality of learning materials, technologies and other products" (p. 59). Not only must the innovation have "high quality, practical and usable resources" but teachers must attain a sense of "meaning and practicality" in the early stages of trying the innovation.

However, Fullan reminds us that change is more than "being told and shown what to do" and being supplied with supporting usable materials. Rather it is "what people develop in their minds and actions that counts" (p. 62).

The remaining categories deal with the social characteristics of the change. At a local level, the school district is capable of helping or hindering effective change. A history of successful implementations of innovations provides a degree of guarantee that future ones will also be successful for "people carry meanings from one experience to the next" (p. 63). The adoption process is also important. Principals and teachers see little reason to implement a new change if the central administrators' decisions to adopt a new change are based on opportunistic reasons. Although central administrators' support and involvement is not necessary for change to occur in the classroom or school, it is necessary for district-wide change. Staff development is seen as the key factor related to change in teaching practices, for before educational change can take place, "learning new ways of thinking and doing, new skills, knowledge, attitudes, etc." (p. 66) must occur first. Yet most inservice training usually takes the form of brief, 'one-shot' workshops which stress technical skills but provide little of the conceptual understanding which is needed for ongoing use. An effective training approach would include "concrete teacher-specific training activities, ongoing continuous assistance and support during the process of implementation, and regular meetings with peers and others" (p. 66). Since implementation is a process and not an event, it does take time. Realistic time lines are needed so as not to add to the problems of implementation. Trying to get everything done in a short time can result in frustration and burnout. Open-ended time lines create confusion about what is expected to be done and when. Related to the factor of time is evaluation. The question of how much time is needed before the innovation should be tested to see if it is effective requires careful consideration. Knowing what kind of information to collect and how to use it is also crucial. The last factor under "Characteristics at the School District Level" deals with board and community characteristics. Conflicts can arise if the board and/or community do not support an innovation. Successful planning for a change has, as one of its tasks, the solicitation of community and board endorsement.

School level factors include "principal role, peer relationships and teacher orientations." Principals play a decisive role in the implementation of new programs. But it is not enough for a principal to say that he/she supports a new change; words of commitment have to be backed up with actions (attending workshops, providing materials, providing encouragement). Peer relations are also important. Teachers working in isolation rarely develop new skills and behaviors. The quality of teacher-teacher relationships (exchange of ideas, support, positive feelings) are linked to effective implementation. According to Fullan, "one teacher trait related to successful implementation and student learning is: teacher sense of efficacy" (p. 72) (teacher belief that he/she can make a difference despite the students' problems). Research suggests that efficacy tends to be a feature of the organization of the school. A school that believes and states that it can improve student learning usually does.

2. The Role of Belief

There is, as Werner (1980) points out, one factor often overlooked in the implementation process -- the role of belief. In other words, "everyone involved with programs does not hold and share the same beliefs and assumptions" (p. 55). Programs may fail not because they lack quality, practicality, curriculum fit, endorsement, etc., but because they may be "based on assumptions not always shared by teachers" (p. 55). The views teachers have concerning such critical educational questions as:

> What does it mean to be a student? What is important to know, and what is worthwhile teaching? What is learning and teaching? What should or should not be done in schools? (p. 56)

are primarily shaped by their everyday experiences in the classroom. Programs though "premised on answers to these questions" (p. 56) may not match the "experience and views of teachers" (p. 56). For teachers who perceive a program as "relevant to their own situations and in harmony with their own views" (p. 56), implementation is rather straight forward. Others, who interpret the program as irrelevant to what they believe is needed in the classroom, may reject the program. Still others may, so that the program suits their own intents and perceptions of their classrooms, adapt the program to the point where it becomes unrecognizable, or use it in ways for which it was never intended. As Werner clearly states:

> A program is much more then a listing of some teaching strategies and materials, but is also a set of beliefs, including underlying assumptions and implied roles which often may not be stated but which do have implications for the commitment teachers will give to the program. (p. 57)

D. Summary

Writing as a process is an approach to the teaching of writing. There is no one set program, and programs will vary from teacher to teacher. However, there are a number of characteristics that will be common to the various programs. While writing as a process is amiable to adaptation so that it can be used by a variety of teachers in a variety of classrooms, its characteristics can be adapted to the point where they no longer serve the purposes for which they were intended. Writing as a process does require a number of significant changes for a teacher who subscribes to the traditional paradigm, and the process of trying to implement the program can be a difficult one.

Training programs like those offered by the National Writing Projects are seen as offering solutions to a number of the implementation problems (i.e., clarification of writing as a process, solutions for making it fit within the English curriculum, resolution of belief conflicts). However, information as to what happens after the training program, such as how much change occurs and why some teachers are able to implement and others are not, is scarce.

Implementation is a complex, multidimensional process. The identification of key factors (i.e., characteristics of the innovation, ongoing support, teacher communication) is one method of characterizing implementation and "has the advantage of isolating and explaining specific roles" (Fullan, 1991, p. 67). These factors "interact to produce conditions for change or non-change" (Fullan, 1991, p. 92). Investigation of why implementation of an innovation fails or succeeds involves the examination of the factors affecting the implementation, and whether they supported or worked against implementation. This is the area investigated in this study.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter, the research methodology used in the study is outlined chronologically. The questionnaire and interview guide is described, as well as the selection of the research participants, questionnaire and interview procedures, and data analysis process.

Both a questionnaire and interview guide were used to collect the data needed to construct as complete a picture as possible of the implementation of writing as a process as undertaken by the two groups (non-implementers and implementers). The purpose of the questionnaire was to collect data that would be too time consuming to collect during the interview, to facilitate comparison of the two groups, and to give the research subjects time to reflect on their implementation experiences and to be prepared for the interview. The purpose of the interview was to provide more in-depth information not elicited in the questionnaire, and to allow for the possibility of pursuing unanticipated issues that arose in individual situations.

A. Research Subjects

The subjects of the study consisted of eight experienced teachers of secondary English. All taught in large urban school districts, in a large metropolitan area in British Columbia and two surrounding cities. Two teachers had just retired at the time of this study. All teachers had participated in the writing workshops conducted by the University of British Columbia Department of Language of Education. They were initially suggested as possible subject candidates by a faculty member of the Department of Language Education who knew them in various professional capacities (including having supervised student teachers in many of their classrooms), and considered four to be implementers, and four not to be implementers of writing as a process. All eight teachers who were considered for this study agreed to participate when contacted by phone by the researcher.

B. Development and Administration of Questionnaire

1. Development

The questionnaire (see Appendix B) was designed to elicit the following information:

- teacher familiarity with the various features of writing as a process
- level of use of strategies and reasons for level of use
- sources of information
- information concerning the workshop, interaction, and support
- background demographic information

A pilot questionnaire (see Appendix C) was developed in collaboration with the researcher's faculty advisor and field tested using one English teacher, known to the researcher, to establish the appropriateness of content and length, and the clarity of the terms and questions. Requiring specification, a number of open-ended questions dealing with prewriting, drafting and revision strategies, and types of writing assignments were revised as forced-choice responses while other questions were left open-ended. The following is an open-ended question from the original questionnaire:

> What types of writing assignments did your students do before you attended the workshop?

The following is the above question revised as a forced-choice question from the revised questionnaire:

1. Please indicate, by circling the appropriate response, how frequently you assigned the following types of writing assignments to your students before you attended the workshop.

a. essay writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently
b. expressive writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently
c. creative writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently
d. business writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently

After revision, the questionnaire was field tested again using another English teacher known to the researcher. The results of the field test were satisfactory, and the questionnaire was used for this study.

2. Administration

The questionnaires were mailed, with a covering letter (see Appendix B) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope, to the teachers shortly after they indicated their willingness to participate in this study.

C. Development and Administration of Interview Guide

1. Development

A semi-structured open-ended interview guide was developed (see Appendix D) in collaboration with the researcher's faculty advisor. The guide was developed with the purpose of gathering in-depth data concerning teachers' writing programs before and after they attended the writing workshops, changes that were made and the causes of the changes. Although a standardized guide limits the interviewer's flexibility, as much flexibility as possible was allowed for in the interview guide itself, and during the interviews to encourage in-depth exploration of the interviewees' implementation experiences. The interview guide was structured chronologically as follows:

- the respondents' teaching of writing before the workshop
- perceived need for changes
- writing as a process offering solutions
- present teaching of writing
- major changes which occurred and their causes
- problems encountered when writing as a process was first used
- the effects of the workshop.

2. Administration

After the completed questionnaires were returned, the teachers were again contacted by phone so that a time and place, convenient to the teachers, could be arranged for the interviews. Figure 2 is a schedule of the interviews, where they were held and when. Pseudonyms are used to protect the identity of the subjects: implementers are those whose name begins with the letter I, while non-implementers' pseudonyms begin with the letter N.

Interviews lasted approximately forty minutes. However, the interview time with Nancy was shortened to twenty minutes since she had to attend to unanticipated business. All participants agreed to the tape-recording of the interviews except Nick. In this case, notes were made by the researcher during the interview. The tape-recordings were subsequently transcribed using a computer word processor (Appendix E contains one transcript provided as an example).

Figure 2
Schedule of Interviews

Name	Place	Date
Nick	his school	June 23, 1988
Nancy	her school	June 29, 1988
Ike	his school	June 30, 1988
Irene	researcher's home	July 1, 1988
Ian	his home	July 2, 1988
Ivy	UBC campus	July 3, 1988
Norm	his home	July 12, 1988
Ned	his home	July 28, 1988

D. Method of Data Analysis

The questionnaire was summarized in table form which contrasted the two groups (non-implementers and implementers) in the following categories:

- writing workshop
- interaction and support
- teacher awareness and use of the characteristics of the innovation
- personal background

This data is presented in Chapter 4, Tables 1-10 and Appendix F.

Interview data was examined and put into the following categories:

- teaching of writing before the workshop
- perceived need for change
- effects of the workshop

- teaching of writing after
- description of
- major changes and their causes
- problems encountered

In Chapter 4, the data are described and illustrated with relevant quotes taken directly from the interviews.

Both questionnaire and interview data were examined for similarities within the two groups for each category. Then the two groups were compared for differences. The data were analyzed for factors which affected implementation, and the factors were described in context of how they helped/hindered implementation of writing as a process.

Chapter 4

Questionnaire and Interview--Findings

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the questionnaires and interviews. Since this study investigates the question of why some teachers were able to implement writing as a process, and others were not, the eight research subjects were divided into two equal groups of four--implementers and non-implementers. The research subjects were considered to be implementers or non-implementers by a faculty member of the Department of Language Education. Pseudonyms were used to protect the identity of the subjects. The pseudonyms of implementers begin with the letter I (Ike, Irene, Ivy, and Ian), and the pseudonyms of non-implementers begin with the letter N (Nancy, Nick, Norm, and Ned).

This chapter is divided into eight sections:

Section A	Teaching of Writing Before
Section B	Perceived Need for Change
Section C	The Writing Workshop
Section D	Interaction and Support
Section E	Teacher Awareness and Use of the Characteristics of the Innovation
Section F	Teaching of Writing After
Section G	Personal Background
Section H	Summary

A. Teaching of Writing Before

This section summarizes interview data concerned with implementers and non-implementers teaching of writing before they became aware of writing as a process.

There appeared to be a number of similarities between the two groups, implementers and non-implementers, in their teaching of writing before they attended the UBC writing workshops. In general, both groups used a traditional approach. The writing was assigned by the teacher, was usually expository, written as a response to the literature which had been read and discussed, and was assigned for the purpose of testing students' understandings of the literature. Teachers usually gave information about expected requirements concerning the content and the form the writing was to take. Students wrote in isolation at home or in class and were expected to hand in their work at a time specified by the teacher. Evaluation of writing was based on how the writing met the requirements expected for content and form.

As not all teachers are the same, teacher variation in different aspects can be expected to occur within this generalized approach. However, it was the non-implementers who gave examples of variations. The majority of implementers did not. Three implementers summarized their method of teaching writing before the UBC writing workshop in few words, terminology, and broad generalities. They did not give specific examples of what they did (e.g., nature of discussions before writing began, expectations of work). There was only one implementer (Ivy) who did give specific examples. She was also the only implementer to maintain she had been using the process approach as portrayed in the writing workshops, throughout her teaching career.

The other three implementers did not give the detailed illustrations that Ivy did. On the other hand, non-implementers did give specific information concerning writing assignments, purpose of writing, reasons why students wrote in class, teacher direction before writing began, reasons for reading student work and how student revision was handled.

Non-Implementers. Even though two non-implementers maintained they had been using a process approach throughout their careers, their approach was similar to the other two non-implementers. For all members in this group much of the assigned writing is expository and based on literature; that is: a novel, short story or poem is assigned for reading, the selection is discussed and a writing topic, or choice of topics, is assigned:

> We would talk about the characteristics of the characters in the story. . . . Now the students would write about this, and I want in their writing specific examples. If specific examples are not there, then they haven't made the point. (Norm)

> Every student, regardless of grade, always has a novel to read and usually after they have read that novel I will test them in a variety of ways, primarily testing the higher levels of thinking. I do this through writing. (Nancy)

> The writing assignments were always based on literature, and they were marked for language and content. . . . The writing has to reveal literature value. The students were expected to express a point of view, a value, information. The intention of the assignment is to test knowledge. (Nick)

Although teachers did say they used writing to test understanding of the literature, they did have other purposes for having students write:

> I tell the kids in September, "You are here primarily to improve yourself in the art of expressing yourself on paper, and if at the end of the year you forget what short stories we discussed in October, I really don't care, as long as you can tell me that you are so much more competent, and comfortable with the art of expressing yourself on paper than you were in September." (Ned)

> I try to touch their feelings. I really have a very strong emphasis on subjective writing. (Nancy)

> But I insisted that they write something about every piece of literature that we do, otherwise it is just gone. (Norm)

The assignment may be written in class or at home (depending on the length required), handed in at a specified time, marked and then returned to the student. All teachers said a number of assignments would be written in class. Reasons for this varied from the belief that students need to learn how to write under pressure, so that help could be provided, and to ensure management:

> I would encourage teachers to insist the writing be handed in after 30 minutes, not to take it home because too many kids have the attitude, "I can't do it now but I'll do it at home," or "I can't concentrate now," and they waste the time in class. Sometimes when it is taken home it doesn't come back, and we have an obligation to get them writing and thinking under a little bit of pressure. (Ned)

Before the writing assignment actually began most of the non-implementers did preparatory work in anticipation of lack of student interest and foreseeable problems with the actual writing assignment.

Ned believed his students needed to be motivated if they were to write well:

> It was probably my assumption that if I came up with an interesting enough topic that that would be enough. That would be the teaching process. My topic, because it would be fascinating, would be enough to get them inspired to write brilliantly.

Nancy encouraged her students to brainstorm, get their ideas down, make an outline and then write. In other words, she would encourage her students to do as much planning as possible before actually writing. Norm provided in-depth discussions of the literature, and provided direction as to what he expected his students' writings to look like. Nick did not indicate how content was generated by his students. In describing his approach to writing assignments he stated that three topics were assigned, the students were to choose one and write on that topic in class.

Teacher direction was not only provided concerning the content of the writing assignments, but also concerning the form the writing was to take. Three non-implementers pointed out that students needed to be taught the framework for the writing. All three gave the expository essay as an example, which Norm summarized as follows:

> Getting the students to be able to put their ideas in some form requires that they have structure in their heads before they start writing. The outlining method is excellent for that. So, in fact, is a five paragraph essay, there is a minimum of nine points, three per paragraph, hinted at in the opening paragraph and clinched in the concluding paragraph.

Nancy did not speak of the framework her students' writings were to take; rather she emphasized the method by which her students were to write:

> Now, I also have what I call seven-step writing process, and I insist that they hand in the whole writing process. It comes in a package like this: the first one is brainstorming, then there is an outline, then there is the introduction, and I insist they show me that they have thought about that introduction--I want three different introductions--, and then the same thing for the conclusion, and then I have the draft copy. I read the whole thing--obviously skim. Then they have the final copy, so I get the whole package. I give them marks for each process. I, obviously, am not marking the quality of the content, but I am giving them credit for going through the process. I want to see they have made changes. I want to see that they have thought, that they have changed, revised, and they get marks for it.

Nancy's concern appeared to be that her students realize a piece of writing had to be reworked.

All non-implementers read and marked the written work that they had assigned to their students. Even though two teachers found this tedious, they did cite reasons why it was necessary. Nick stated it was the "students' right; they did the work," and he had the responsibility to read it and make comments about it. Ned made the similar remark that students expected not only a mark, but reasons why they received the mark they did. Ned also based what he was going to teach on what his students had written:

> You just don't get to know your kids if you don't read the stuff yourself, if you don't mark the stuff yourself. You don't know your own kids, don't know what they need, don't know what to emphasize in formal writing classes. The only way you glean what you should be teaching is by

> reading what they have written, and figuring out where they are deficient.

Ned noted that students were reluctant to revise their work, and rather than ask them to rewrite or correct their work, he would "move on to another assignment," and have them revise but "under the guise of a completely new topic." This can be interpreted to mean if there was a particular type of error that he noticed in the students' writings, he would give a lesson and/or assignment dealing with that error.

Norm was the only non-implementer who pointed out a way of dealing with student revision while relieving some of the burden of teacher marking. Before an assignment was handed in, students would be put into groups of four and they would edit each other's work for spelling, grammar and "checking on the content, checking that there is unity, checking that the essay does what it sets out to do." The editing checklist would vary for different assignments. The students would then take their assignments home, rewrite them and hand them in. As Norm pointed out the assignments would not "float away in a sea of red ink because a lot of the mistakes have been taken out."

Of the three non-implementers, Norm was the only one to indicate that his students' finished products were shared with others. Norm would, at times, read the students' writings to his class, and each student would "jot down information for themselves to write a critique, and they would write it in the form of a letter." Norm collected the letters, gave marks to students who did them, and then the students gave the letters to those for whom they were written.

Implementers. Ivy was the only implementer to maintain that her teaching of writing had not changed, "I did what I am doing now without the labels on it." Her descriptions of the writing activities her students engaged in included prewriting activities, students writing together in groups, teacher working with students, and extended readership of the finished product. Ivy provided one example as follows:

> It would be 1973-74, and we were doing description of senses. I brought in herbs and spices, they sniffed and commented, and wrote it down. Everyone had a good time. Then we went through a lab workshop on all of the senses and they took notes. We took all the prewritings and worked in small groups. There must have been twenty kids, three student teachers, and myself, so we were group leaders. We all created our writings, group writings. Each student did writing that they had to present in a booklet form and share with someone. Those were the initial things that got me thinking. This was long before the workshop.

Ivy, however, did say that some aspects of her writing program were modified after she attended the writing workshop (e.g., she no longer graded all written work, and not all work was brought to the presentation stage).

The descriptions provided by the other three implementers concerning their teaching of writing before they became aware of the process approach are very much the same and share a number of similarities with three of the non-implementers' approaches prior to changes they made. Ian's following description, succinctly summarizes the approach taken by himself, Irene and Ike:

> The approach was exactly the same as I had been taught, a teacher-directed approach. That is, I generated the topic. several times I would give a choice of topics, but they were all generated by me. Students wrote in class without any consultation. Usually it was teaching as testing, and writing as testing. I would take it home, edited it all, hand

> it all back, and expect them to have learned it. Some did of course. Sometimes, they had to rewrite it, and hand it back in. They had to make the corrections on it. Very seldom did they have to rewrite the whole thing. . . . My teaching was basically a literature approach as opposed to sentencing or how to add details. They wrote for me. Marking was heavy; it was like a labour of love.

Even though there are similarities between the approaches taken by the implementers (excluding Ivy) and the non-implementers, the similarity is in what they did, not how they talked about it. Implementers did not give examples or specifications such as the non-implementers used to describe their methods. Rather implementers used terms and generalities. They had codified what it was that they had done. Ian provided an example of this when he used the generalization "writing as testing." Within this generalization there are implications concerning what the purpose of student writing was and what the students were being evaluated for. But Ian did not specify what this was. Norm, however, did, as the following demonstrates: "Now the students would write about it, and I want, in their writing, specific examples. If the specificity is not there they haven't made the point. Vague generalizations are not acceptable."

By not giving examples, by using terms and generalizations, it is as if implementers regarded what they did before the workshops from a distance; for when they spoke of their present teaching they were more explicit and did give examples. It appeared that they categorized their previous approach, and that they contrasted it with another way of teaching writing. Ian termed his previous way of teaching as "teacher-directed" and used "student-centred" to label his present approach. Irene, when asked about her present teaching, used her past methodology to clarify what she was presently doing, as shown by the following:

> What you don't do is assign writing and say, "I want it at the end of the period," or "Bring it to me next period," or something like that. You don't do that.

Implementers (except for Ivy), unlike the non-implementers, through the manner in which they spoke of the their past teaching gave a sense of time past and present. The sense of time past is lacking in the non-implementers' dialogue.

B. Perceived Need for Change

This section summarizes interview data concerning changes teachers perceived that needed to be made in the the teaching of writing, and what they perceived as solutions to the problems.

Implementers and non-implementers did perceive problems in the teaching of writing. However, there appeared to be differences[1] in the type of problem perceived by each group. Non-implementers tended to give specific problems (e.g., difficulties in getting students to write, and lack of student willingness to revise). Implementers, on the other hand, gave the same general problem instead of a number of specific ones. For implementers, the problem was not in the teaching of writing, but the way writing was taught.

Non-Implementers. Three non-implementers gave a number of specific problems they had noted in the teaching of writing: the "teaching of grammar for grammar's sake," student inability to transfer understandings of grammar lessons to their writing, lack of student motivation to write, and lack of student ability or interest to revise. However, in naming these problems, non-implementers also gave some solutions. For example, Ned stated that "it is better to switch topics than to have students revise the piece they've done again, and again" or else to concentrate on two or three types of errors at a time in a student's work. Nancy, dealt with this problem by circulating among her students, giving individual assistance when students were working on their drafts. She did not feel peer editing would be valuable.

---

[1] It should be noted that these are not statistically significant differences. Due to the small sample population, such calculations could not be made.

Nick stated that one of the problems was in what was being said about the teaching of writing, in that it did "not mesh with the classroom." However, he did feel that some of the strategies used in writing as a process were helpful such as, brainstorming, and class discussion before writing began.

Norm maintained that he could not see any problems with the way writing was being taught. He summarized his perceptions as follows:

> I do not see any problems with methods at all. . . . It is not the method that makes the difference, it is the teacher. You can teach a bad teacher the best methods in the world and he is still a bad teacher.

He also stated that both he and his school have received feedback which supports the type of teaching of writing that they do:

> I must have been teaching ten or twelve years when I felt that I was getting enough feedback that whatever it was that I was doing, was right.
>
> . . . when a university, particularly UBC or SFU, does it, they will send a report back to the school about how the students who graduated from our school are doing at university. Consistently we are high in the ratings for English 100. We

> think that's because we are insistent upon our students being able to write essays competently.

Implementers. Implementers, rather than stating a number of specific problems, gave the same general problem. All felt that changes were needed in the way writing was taught. Three implementers expressed dissatisfaction with the way they had taught writing, and one implementer (Ivy) was dissatisfied with the way other teachers taught writing. Ian stated that his approach was "too teacher-directed, and teacher-in-control" with the result that he did most of the work (i.e., generating topics, and editing writing), and that despite his efforts his students "didn't seem to be doing any better." Ivy expressed much the same idea, but stated that this teacher-centred approach made the students dependent on the teacher. Irene expressed dissatisfaction with her instruction which consisted of assigning writing, marking writing, and giving grammar lessons. Ike summarized his perceptions concerning what needed to be changed as follows:

> I always felt, since I began teaching, there was something wrong with the approach. I felt it was wrong because I experienced it first as a student, the mechanical nature of the writing, the classical and typical, "What did you do last summer?" kind of thing. But writing was supposed to be something isolated from everything else. You were a good writer because you knew grammar. I was always dissatisfied with that approach both as a student and as a teacher. As a teacher, I felt the dissatisfaction but I didn't know how to go about doing something about it. I tried any number of things intuitively, but I don't know if those intuitive things remedied a lot of problems.

It is interesting to note, not only that all implementers perceived that the problem with the teaching of writing was the way in which writing was taught, but also, that three of the implementers used their own past methodologies as their examples.

However, it should be noted that all implementers had worked together on their district's writing committee. This helps to explain the similarity in the implementers' responses. According to Ian and Irene (who was a district coordinator) the committee was formed in response to the British Columbia Assessment of Written Expression of 1978. Ian and Irene note that there were perceived problems with the way the report talked about writing:

> I was on the original Written Expression committee which was formed, I think, in 1978. The B.C. government had done a writing assessment and some of the recommendations, I think they made about 30 of them, were things like kids need more skill work, work in grammar, and they were applying the same preconceived ideas about writing based on the assessment. So we had a look at some of the research and we had a look at what was happening in the way of composition and we realized it was the approach that was wrong. (Ian)
>
> We first responded to the written assessment. We may have had ten meetings, before the workshop, where we talked about the recommendations that the Learning Assessment Branch had made from the written assessment and we knew that something was wrong in the recommendations and so we had a lot of pre-discussion on it. (Ian)
>
> I thought if the idea was that we were going to deliberately set out to improve students' writing abilities that we had to improve our instruction; and looking at writing piecemeal, as a collection of skills, that was nonsense. That's what people had been doing all along, you know--worksheets, fill in this and fill in that. It seems to me, any instruction, essentially, really looked at what I call proofreading skills: the mechanics, punctuation, spelling, and maybe topic sentences. But as far as really looking at

> writing as a whole, I don't think there were too many people who were doing anything about that or had been. I thought that was really the only way we could go with any hope of success. So we certainly had to reject writing as a collection of skills [Around this time UBC started off on its workshops?] Yes. It was probably because they were responding to that report too. (Irene)

Meeting together as a group, and responding to the assessment gave the implementers the opportunity to examine and discuss not only what the Ministry was saying about the teaching of writing, but also their own teaching practices. Their vague feelings of "something wrong" crystallized into the need to change the way writing was taught. Irene did note that shortly after the writing committee had formed and met a number of times, the UBC writing workshops, which provided an alternate approach to the teaching of writing, began. All implementers regarded writing as a process as the approach needed to replace the current approach.

It appears that the four implementers, through their work on their district's writing committee were able to identify a need and link it to the selection of a program. This ability, as Fullan (1991) points out, is "strongly related to successful implementation" (p.69).

C. The Writing Workshop

This section is concerned with when and for how long teachers attended the UBC writing workshops, and how they were affected by them. That they did attend indicates that members of both groups were interested in the teaching of writing and were possibly looking for ideas they could use to improve their teaching.

1. Year and Duration of Workshop Attended

As can be seen in Table 1, which presents the years in which non-implementers and implementers attended the writing workshop provided by the Language Department of Education of the University of British Columbia, and the length of time of the workshop each member attended, members of both groups attended within a range of 3 years, and all experienced 3 to 5 days of training.

Table 1
Workshop: Year Attended and Duration

	Non-Implementers N=4	Implementers N=4
Year attended	1981 (1) 1982 (1) no reply (2)	1979 (3) 1980 (1)
Workshop duration	3 days (2) 5 days (1) no reply (1)	3 days (2) 5 days (1) 3 days and 5 days (1)

It is interesting to note that implementers attended the writing workshops before non-implementers, and also that implementers were among the first participants since the workshops did not begin until 1979. This appears to suggest that the implementers were among the leaders of writing as a process in British Columbia, and could indicate an early commitment to changing the way writing was taught.

2. Effect of Workshop

The effects of the workshops differed between the two groups. Whereas implementers, as a group, gave positive responses, the non-implementers' responses varied from less than favourable to positive. Implementers not only indicated that the workshops they attended presented ideas they could use, but each perceived a particular benefit that the workshop had offered (e.g., acting as a catalyst for change, unifying the teaching of writing). Though two non-implementers said the workshop provided some ideas they could use, most non-implementers appeared to have implied that the writing approach that was presented at the workshop was not for them.

Non-Implementers. For most of the non-implementers, the writing workshop was just another workshop. Nancy could not remember it. Nick stated the workshop gave enough examples, and increased his awareness of the process of writing which "helped with the frustrations of dealing with students' writings." However, he also stated that workshop leaders "should research what is really needed by teachers," and that "teachers want something quick, charming, that will work right now." Ned also stated that he looks for certain things when he goes to a workshop:

> I look for practical advice for teaching kids writing skills, practical, useful advice and lots of it.

Ned maintained the workshop was of little value for him. There was "nothing completely new" as he heard "the instructors at Trinity say the same thing," nor did the workshop provide enough examples of the writing strategies. Ned also found it difficult to focus on what was being done in the workshop, the cause of which he explained as follows:

> We were informed from the beginning of the first day, that at the end of the third day, we would have to publicly stand up at the podium and give our own piece of writing. That was on my mind most of the time so, I think, a lot of the things they were doing passed me by.

Norm learned about his own writing process, and he learned that he was an English teacher, not a writing teacher. Norm defined an English teacher as follows:

> . . . somebody who has a feeling for not only what writers say, but how they say it. In other words, I'm at the receiving end of the writing process rather than at the generating end.

Even though he came to the realization he "could not sustain a writing course," the workshop did provide him with ideas to use in his general English classes.

Implementers. Responses from the implementers concerning the effects of the writing workshop they attended were positive. The workshop was perceived as useful since it provided a number of ideas and strategies that could be used in the classroom (i.e., conferencing strategies, display of students' writings, and integration of the teaching of grammar). However, the workshop leaders did more than present ideas. Irene recalled that the workshop leaders involved "people in actually doing things, doing various kinds of writing, examining what they were doing, and talking about it." She also said she experienced a "profound change in attitude and belief." Ivy perceived the workshop as unifying the teaching of writing in her district, and that it legitimatized what she was already doing. Ian recalled that the workshop with its combination of ideas and people acted as a "catalyst for change," and Ike stated the workshop was valuable in that it provided the opportunity for collaboration and dialogue.

The workshops recalled by the implementers appear to have been of a more dynamic nature than those recalled by the non-implementers.

There is also a feeling of teachers interacting with teachers in the implementers' workshops that is missing in the non-implementers' workshops. It is not known if most of the implementers attended the same workshop, though three did attend a workshop in the same year, or if in the workshops attended by the implementers, most of the participants knew each other.

One possible explanation for the favourable workshop response given by the implementers, is that the workshops had the right ideas at the right time for the implementers. The implementers had already met as a writing committee a number of times prior to their workshops, and they continued to get together after the workshop. Ian states that these pre-workshop meetings prepared the way for the workshops; that by the time he attended the workshop he already had an understanding and acceptance of the writing approach the workshop was presenting: "It was like preaching to the converted." By belonging to this committee, members received information, and on-going inservice which aided implementation of writing as a process:

> There was, also, for me, the group commitment in the writing committee. This was like part of a much larger inservice; it wasn't a one-shot thing. We went back to the committee and tried all these things and then had an opportunity to follow up. Actually, it was the discussions about it later with all the other people, so the workshop fit in for me differently from the way it did for other people I'm sure. (Ian)

> I found when I took the workshop and I was involved in the Writing Committee, it was helpful. This is great for teachers to internalize what it is they are doing and to question themselves and examine themselves and to explore things they feel but haven't really tried. (Ike)

The writing workshops, instead of being isolated, one-shot occurrences (as they appeared to have been for the non-implementers), were part of a social context in which the implementers were interpreting the meaning of the innovation.

D. Interaction and Support

This section is concerned with the interaction both groups participated in, and the type of support they received when they first tried using writing as a process after they attended the workshops. Implementers appeared to have engaged in more interaction, and to have received more support than the non-implementers.

Members of both groups did discuss writing as a process with their colleagues. However, two implementers also assumed a more active position in the process of implementation by arranging and conducting workshops. No non-implementers undertook such a task. This is shown in Table 2 which displays the activities (conduct a writing workshop, arrange a writing workshop, discuss this writing approach with colleagues) non-implementers and implementers engaged in after attending the Language Education Department writing

Table 2
Post-Workshop Interaction

	Non-Implementers N=3	**Implementers N=4**
conduct a writing workshop	no (3)	no (2), yes (2)
arrange a writing workshop	no (3)	no (2), yes (2)
discuss this writing approach with your colleagues	yes (3)	yes (4)

Note: The numbers in brackets indicate the number of teachers who made that response.

workshop. Willingness to expend the energy necessary for the displayed ventures demonstrates commitment to, and knowledge about the innovation. The act of arranging and conducting workshops also provides contact and dialogue with other teachers and shows there is support from the various levels of school hierarchy.

As can be seen by Table 3, which displays the type of support non-implementers and implementers indicated they received from various sources when they first began using writing as a process, more implementers responded than did non-implementers. Of the non-implementers, Norm was the only one to respond about support. Norm lacked support from school and district administrators, but did receive support from his colleagues and English department head. However, Norm made it very clear in the questionnaire and interview that he found writing as a process unsuitable, and it is Norm who decides what he is going to do in his classroom. One possible explanation for the lack of response from the other non-implementers concerning support is that no support was available.

Perceptions of support varied for the implementers. Ike indicated he had favorable support from colleagues through to district administration. Irene wrote about her role as district coordinator for secondary English. She did everything she could "to promote this approach to writing among secondary English teachers." She saw writing as "well promoted" in the district although, for a variety of reasons, the process approach was more successful at the elementary schools. Ivy saw her colleagues as "getting involved," and as for support from the department head--she was the department head. Nothing was noted on her questionnaire about school administration and district support. Ian's situation appears to be different. He felt that there was little support from his colleagues, but that his school administrators were aware of writing as a process and that they were supportive. As for the district office, Ian perceived it as more supportive of implementation at the elementary level, leaving secondary teachers much to themselves.

Table 3
Type of Support Received From Various Sources After Workshop

	Non-Implementers N=1 (Norm)	Implementers N=3
colleagues	good	good (Ike), got involved (Ivy), not much (Ian)
English Department Head	excellent	supportive (Ike), I am a dept. head (Ivy), no (Ian)
school administrators	who?	supportive (Ike), aware of approach, supportive (Ian)
district administrators		supportive (Ike), supportive of process in elementary but left up to secondary teachers (Ian)
others		students reacted favourably and the feedback from parents was that kids like to write now (Ian)

At Ian's school, there may have been some resistance to this approach. Writing as a process may have been perceived as a fad or that it really didn't have much to do with the teaching of high school

English. In addition, Ian's English Department Head was not supportive of this approach, which may be part of the explanation for the attitude of his colleagues. Ian also perceived district administrative support as favouring implementation at the elementary school level. Even though Ian was in the same school district as the other implementers, his responses suggest he had the least supportive environment in which to implement writing as a process. However, Ian, unlike any other member in either group, said that he received approval from parents, and that his students reacted favourably.

Non-implementers did not mention whether or not they had received support. Implementers, however, did talk about the support they received from their district writing committee of which they were members. For them, implementation of writing as a process was a group as well as an individual effort.

The formation and funding of this group was seen as district support for writing as a process:

> And because the school board supported it, it was really neat. It became a district committed to writing and I knew I wasn't alone. We set up the Writing Project. I think originally there may have been twenty-two people who sat on that. UBC continued to run writing workshops and more and more people were sent out at the same time. Our district was providing a lot of new information, where, because it was district policy, more people caught onto it [writing as a process]. (Ivy)

The district signaled its support of the writing committee and of writing as a process by providing funds for teacher release time, for workshops, for publication of materials, for purchasing materials, and by encouraging school administrators' awareness of writing as a process:

> We meet in a committee. The district gave us time off to meet. We had to give up some time after school, but we had time off right out of the classroom. (Ivy)
>
> Money was not a problem. . . . I managed to arrange for UBC people to put on a special three day workshop for my writing committee. . . . Then we had a couple of sessions in the district for interested teachers. . . . each time UBC put on a workshop I would manage to send, because money was there, maybe four or five teachers. So it got to the point where just about all of the secondary teachers had been to the workshop. (Irene)
>
> . . . and we wrote our own book . . . . (Ian)
>
> . . . we put out a whole booklet for loose-leaf binders for teachers. (Irene)
>
> We had the money to buy books . . . . (Irene)
>
> We were fortunate in our district that the principals themselves had to attend a mini-version of the UBC workshop. (Ivy)

The committee was able to maintain momentum and energy so that implementation, which takes time, was ensured:

> We had a very high powered group. We had some people come in after the committee went about three years [three years after the committee was formed] and we wrote our own book. It was pioneer work in those days [1979-1982]. It was very exciting. (Ian)

By belonging to their district's writing committee, the implementers demonstrated their interest in and commitment to the teaching of writing. They were provided with information and the opportunity to enter into dialogue concerning this information, about what they were doing, about what others were doing and about future possibilities. Through dialogue, they clarified, affirmed, or possibly changed or modified their beliefs, assumptions, and perceptions they had concerning their teaching practices. They were given and/or created the opportunities to consider new ideas, ideas which may have needed to be critically examined. As Werner (1987) points out, the conversations teachers have with others impact not only on the understanding they have about the innovation, but also on their process of implementing the innovation:

> As teachers discuss their experiences and concerns with change, and share their expertise in the task of modifying innovations (interpreting goals; selecting, modifying, or developing materials and activities; and designing evaluation), implementation is facilitated (Werner, 1981; Olson, 1982). Through this involvement they come to understand an innovation better than if a finished "product" were handed to them; they are able to build in their relevances and interests into the innovation and consequently, they become committed as it represents their own work. It is through such colleagual dialogue and mutual help that implementation training becomes synonymous with professional development. (p. 45)

By belonging to their district's writing committee, implementers had the opportunity to discuss not only the innovation, but also how to implement. This may be one of the major factors which helped in the implementation of writing as a process, and it helps to explain why some teachers were able to implement and others were not.

E. Teacher Awareness and Use of the Characteristics of the Innovation

This section is concerned with teacher knowledge and use of the characteristics of the innovation[2]. The idea underlying writing as a process is that teachers intervene in their students' writing process by assisting them with strategies when difficulties are encountered at the prewriting, drafting, and revision stages. Teachers also take into consideration the necessity of widening student audience, establishing writing conferences so that students can receive assistance in their writing as they write, and including different types of writing as well as expository so as to take into account the varied nature of writing.

1. Writing Strategies

Both groups tend to be similar in the number of writing strategies each group was aware of, and both groups did have access to sources which provided them with more strategies than they learned at the workshop. However, implementers appear to remember having received more information at the workshop than non-implementers. On the whole, both groups continued to use the writing strategies they were aware of, and there does not appear to be much difference between the two groups in the strategies that they did use. However, it is surprising that non-implementers did use drafting and revision strategies. How would teachers, considered to be non-implementers use these strategies? It is also interesting to note the strategies commonly used by both groups (i.e., brainstorming, listing, outlining, notes, and assignment rewrites). It may be that these strategies can be used no matter what the approach and/or these strategies can be adapted to fit traditional writing programs. What does appear to be a slight difference between implementers and non-implementers is in the use of strategies which involve students working with students--conferencing, and group work -- which two non-implementers indicated they no longer use, but all implementers still use. In the areas of student reaction to writing strategies, grade appropriate and assignment appropriate strategies, there continues to be little difference between the two groups. However, one implementer did stress that student reaction and appropriateness of strategies depended on how and when strategies are used. Also, implementers, unlike non-implementers, mentioned creative writing as well as expository writing when they indicated strategies as appropriate for types of assignments.

---

[2] This section is based on data collected from the questionnaire whereas the next section, Section F Teaching of Writing After, is based on data collected from the interviews. The reason for presenting questionnaire and interview data separately is that the two instruments collected data from different perspectives which do not lend themselves easily to amalgamation into the report.

a. Writing Strategies Non-Implementers and Implementers Aware of

Table 4 displays the combined number of prewriting, drafting and revision strategies which each group (non-implementers and implementers), as a whole, is aware of. As shown by the Table 4, there is little difference between non-implementers and implementers in the number of strategies each group is aware of. Implementers do know more prewriting strategies, but only four more, and only one more revision strategy than non-implementers. Both groups are aware of twice as many prewriting strategies than they are of drafting or revision strategies.

Table 4
Number of Writing Strategies Both Groups Aware of.

	Non-Implementers	Implementers
Prewriting Strategies	12 (N=4)	16 (N=4)
Drafting Strategies	6 (N=4)	6 (N=3)
Revision Strategies	5 (N=2)	6 (N=3)

As Table 4 shows, there is a decline in the number of writing strategies both groups are aware of from prewriting to drafting and revision strategies. The questionnaire provided six strategies each for prewriting and drafting, and five for revision. Both groups added prewriting strategies to the list (two non-implementers added five prewriting strategies and three implementers added nine), but only one revision strategy was added by an implementer and no drafting strategies were added by anyone in either group. A number of possibilities may explain the lower number of drafting and revision strategies.

First, it is possible that there are far more skills attached to the act of prewriting than there are for the acts of drafting and revision. Second, teachers may have traditionally regarded providing students with the motivation and ideas for beginning the act of writing as the most important part of their job, and so the act of prewriting has received greater teacher focus in journals, textbooks, and workshops. In contrast, drafting and revision have been regarded more as a student, self-directed activity and are therefore considered to be more the responsibility of the student. In other words, teachers have felt it is their responsibility to provide the writing topics, information for getting started, and guidelines for what is required, and it is the student's responsibility to get the assignment written. The teacher may provide assistance in editing the work and may require the student to rewrite the assignment or parts of the assignment before resubmitting it. A third possibility is that teachers may have drafting and revision strategies they employ with their students, but either these strategies do not have identifiable labels, or else they are used on an individual basis rather than on a class basis; as a result, for either reason, teachers may not have included them in the questionnaire.

However, a fourth, and more likely reason for the smaller number of drafting and revision strategies has to do with teacher response to Part I of the questionnaire. As the questionnaire progressed from prewriting to revision, fewer and fewer teachers responded. This is also shown in Table 4. The number of teachers in each group who responded to the questions in: a) Prewriting, b) Drafting, and c) Revision from Part 1. Process Questions is indicated in brackets. Fewer teachers responded to the drafting and revision sections of Part I of the questionnaire than to the prewriting section. It is possible that they found these sections redundant and became tired of filling them out (this was pointed out by Ian during the interview), that they had nothing to say about these points, or, if they did have something to say, that it could not be adequately expressed in the questionnaire format.

b. Sources of Writing Strategies

Table 5 presents the combined number of prewriting, drafting, and revision strategies, and the total numbers of writing strategies non-implementers, and implementers learned at the workshop and elsewhere. (For the number of specific prewriting, drafting, and revision strategies both groups were aware of and where they were learned see Tables 11, 12 and, 13, in Appendix F). Table 5 indicates that both groups did have access to sources other than the workshop which were able to provide them with more writing strategies than the workshop did. Non-implementers indicated that they had learned a total of forty-four writing strategies elsewhere and remembered learning nine strategies at the workshop. Implementers remembered learning fifteen writing strategies at the workshop and forty-three strategies elsewhere. Implementers recalled learning six more strategies at the workshop than the non-implementers.

Table 5
Where Writing Strategies Learned

	Non-Implementers			Implementers		
	N=	Wkshp	Elsewhere	N=	Wkshp	Elsewhere
Prewriting Strategies	4	6	21	4	9	27
Drafting Strategies	4	2	14	3	3	10
Revision Strategies	2	1	9	3	3	6
Totals		9	44		15	43

Except for one implementer (who listed sentence rewrites as being learned both elsewhere and at the workshop) no one indicated learning a strategy both elsewhere and at the workshop. Some teachers listed learning a particular strategy at the workshop and some indicated that the same strategy had not been brought to their attention For example, two implementers listed the drafting strategies models and research as being learned at the workshop yet two other implementers noted they had learned of these strategies elsewhere. This may be a problem with the questionnaire. Possibly some teachers interpreted the question to mean where they **first** learned something.

With the exception of one member from each group, non-implementers and implementers could not pinpoint where (other than the workshop) they had learned of their writing strategies. However, they did list some possibilities: school, university, workshops, seminars, conferences, other teachers, and journals. One non-implementer, did state that he had learned prewriting (brainstorming, research, group work), drafting (notes, focus, point of view), and revision strategies in his teaching methods/courses at university (he had done his teacher training in Great Britain), and one implementer named the English Quarterly as a source of information, but no one else was specific in pointing at something as a source. As one respondent pointed out, a teacher can come into contact with numerous sources of information over time and it is difficult to keep them sorted.

Implementers appear to remember having received more information at the workshop than non-implementers. Implementers remembered learning three more prewriting, one more drafting, and two more revision strategies than non-implementers at the workshop. Also, when asked what strategies they needed more examples of than were provided in the workshop, one non-implementer did express more information would have been helpful for prewriting, drafting, and revision strategies. On the other hand, one implementer required more information concerning only prewriting strategies. (See Appendix F for

Table 14 which displays the prewriting, drafting, and revision strategies which non-implementers and implementers indicated they needed more information about than was provided in the workshop.)

In terms of ability to provide writing strategies, the workshop did not seem to be as helpful as the other sources non-implementers and implementers were able to access. But it appears to have been more helpful to implementers than non-implementers.

c. Level of Use of Writing Strategies

Prewriting Strategies. Table 6 displays the number of non-implementers and implementers who, as a group, indicated they: a) did not use, b) are still using, or c) are no longer using prewriting, drafting, and revision strategies. (For the level of use of specific prewriting, drafting, and revision strategies see Tables 15, 16, and 17 respectively in Appendix F). As Table 6 shows, not only did all members of both groups respond for level of use of prewriting strategies but both groups, on the whole, still use the prewriting strategies they are aware of. Only one implementer indicated a prewriting strategy he did not use (looping) but no reason was given as to why he did not use it.

Table 6
Level of Use of Writing Strategies

	Non-Implementers				Implementers			
	N=	did not use	still using	no longer using	N=	did not use	still using	no longer using
Prewriting Strategies	4	0	11	3	4	1	16	1
Drafting Strategies	4	6	6	0	3	1	6	0
Revision Strategies	2	0	5	0	3	1	5	1

More non-implementers no longer use prewriting strategies (three non-implementers discarded four strategies) than implementers (one implementer discarded one strategy).

Of the implementers, only one discarded a prewriting strategy. Ike no longer uses models. Even though he did say "writing from models in a lot of cases is quite fun" he was not pleased with the results that the use of this strategy produced:

> . . . but in most cases one gets totally derivative writing. I find students follow models slavishly. Those that do not, do not need models in the first place.

One non-implementer also discarded a prewriting strategy on the basis that he perceived that it had no direct benefits for students. Ned no longer uses networking as he "found it too complicated for younger students." Two non-implementers no longer use certain prewriting strategies for reasons not necessarily related to student benefit. Both Norm and Nick singled out strategies that require student interaction (conferencing and group work). Strategies that require student interaction do require a considerable amount of work on the part of the teacher and do present management as well as time problems. For these strategies the benefits may not be readily apparent, whereas the problems are. Nick no longer uses group work since the courses he teaches "do not lend themselves to this approach." Norm also no longer uses group work as well as conferencing but he is more explicit in his reason. He stated that "some students get into it" (I assume he means students do what he expects they should be doing while conferencing) but too many students "allow the discussions to turn into social natter." For him, problems of management outweigh the benefits of the strategy.

Two non-implementers indicated they still use group work and conferencing. This was unexpected for a number of reasons. Underlying these strategies is the belief that students, given guidelines and training, are capable of helping each other in their writing, provided, of course, these strategies are interpreted to mean students are working with students. Also, not only are these strategies capable of causing management problems, they also require other skills to be in place before they can be effective. For example, students need to be coached to interact in a positive manner and to be given suggestions concerning aspects of writing to be discussed. They have to be taught the skills necessary for assessing writing. The dynamics of conferencing and group work need to be assessed for effectiveness and adjustments made for improvement. At times, it can be difficult to justify the expenditure of class time and teacher effort if results are not perceived as beneficial. However, it is possible that these two non-implementers interpreted conferencing and group work differently. That is, conferencing could have been interpreted, not as students conferencing with each other, but, as teacher conferencing with students. Group work is also open to interpretation; it can mean a circumstance in which the class is divided into smaller groups working independently or it may mean the teacher works with a small group of students while the rest of the class works individually.

All members of both groups use brainstorming and listing. The only other strategy commonly used by both non-implementers and implementers is models. Other than these three strategies, non-implementers have no strategies in common as a group. Implementers, however, as a group commonly use conferencing, research and group work.

In terms of prewriting strategies, implementers have more in common with each other than non-implementers. The four implementers did interact and work with each other when they implemented this writing approach. The question arises, would implementers who did not receive such support from a group also use the same prewriting strategies?

Drafting Strategies. Both groups used all the drafting strategies listed on the questionnaire. As shown in Table 6, no drafting strategies were added by either group. Some strategies are more commonly used than others. All members in both groups use outlining, notes, and focus. The two implementers, who indicated level of use, have all strategies in common except point of view. Non-implementers have outlining, notes, focus and point of view in common, but not listing and idea hordes.

Even though Table 6 indicates more non-implementers use drafting strategies than implementers, this might not necessarily be the case. One implementer did not answer this section (as well as the section concerning revision strategies) and his reason (according to statement made during the interview) for not completing was not because he did not use drafting strategies, but because he found the questionnaire redundant and so decided not to complete it. Fortunately, the interview data from Ian compensated for this. Another implementer had difficulties with some of the terms and so had just put question marks beside notes, idea hordes, and focus. She also indicated she did not formally teach drafting strategies for what appears to be two reasons: 1) if a prewriting strategy has been used then the drafting is up to the student; and 2) the approach will vary from student to student. But would she show her students various drafting strategies and then leave it to them to use what they find most suitable? It is difficult to tell what Irene meant by her comments on her questionnaire. Perhaps she thought the questionnaire was referring to writing assignments in which students were expected to demonstrate use of particular drafting strategies. Irene does not appear to teach writing this way. She sees all writing as "creative." She does not think of "types of writing assignments," but "individual assignments." For example, though she says she does not use outlines, she qualifies this statement by saying "formal" outlines. By this she means that she does not have her students write out a precise outline and hand it in before they are permitted to do their writing. However, she does see outlining as appropriate for certain writing assignments (research paper) and she does encourage an awareness in her students "of the value at times of a rough draft." It could be that she does teach drafting strategies, but she does not require drafts to be handed in, instead leaving it to the students to decide whether or not they need to do a rough draft and how they are going to do it.

Unexpectedly, three non-implementers indicated "still using" for drafting strategies. The question arises, if teachers who are considered not to have implemented writing as a process do use drafting strategies, how do they use them? Two implementers did point out that their use of these strategies depended on the particular students. It is possible that non-implementers, rather than intervene in their students' writing processes at appropriate time with suggestions of strategies to help overcome problems, formally teach a specific drafting strategy and then expect, or maybe require, the students to use it as part of their writing assignment. For example, Nancy does require, for certain essays, that her students complete and hand in an outline. Irene, on the other hand, encourages her students to see there is value in doing a rough outline, but does not require one be done. Since the questionnaire asks only about level of use, not how the writing strategies are used, both groups of implementers and non-implementers appear similar. It is difficult, from the data generated by the questionnaire, to perceive differences between the two groups.

Revision Strategies. The features noted for drafting strategies--lack of positive response from implementers and the use of strategies by non-implementers--are also found for revision strategies. Assignment rewrites is the only revision strategy used by both groups. The revision strategy sentence rewrites was rejected by two implementers. Ike no longer uses this strategy since he regards it as limited in its ability to be of use to the students:

> A lot of time sentence rewrites tend to be mechanical in nature--purely rhetorical exercises.

Irene, who indicated she did not use this strategy, did not give a reason why. Perhaps, she, like Ike, regards it as a rhetorical exercise and in her teaching approach the mechanics of writing are handled differently. Two implementers, however, did indicate they still use sentence rewrites.

What the questionnaire does not reveal is how revision strategies are used. At what point do implementers and non-implementers bring revision strategies to the attention of their students--before or after the assignment has been turned in? Also, who makes the decision as to whether or not an assignment or sentence will be rewritten?

d. Student Reaction

As reported by the teachers student reaction towards the writing strategies, as shown by Table 7, tended to be favourable. But there does appear to be a decline in enthusiasm from prewriting to revision. This table, also, does seem to indicate that there are differences between the two groups in degrees of enthusiasm, although only two of the non-implementers responded at all.

All implementers responded for prewriting strategies. Three gave reactions to specific prewriting strategies, whereas one implementer, instead of referring to specific strategies, gave the statement, "Individual students react differently, as does an entire class at different times." Ike was the only implementer to note a non-positive reaction. He noted student reaction for models as neutral. This was also the strategy he no longer uses because it did not produce beneficial results, but lack of student enthusiasm may have been another reason for his abandonment of models.

Although, on the whole, student reaction was seen as favourable towards prewriting strategies by non-implementers, the three strategies of networking, research, and group work did receive mixed student reaction. Ned noted mixed student reaction for networking (a strategy he no longer uses as his students found it too difficult) and for research. Nancy indicated group work as receiving mixed reactions.

Table 7
Student Reaction to Writing Strategies

Prewriting Strategies	N=2	Non-Implementers	N=4	Implementers
Brainstorming		positive (Nancy) always positive (Ned)		positive when used judiciously (Ike) well received (Ivy)
Listing		positive (Nancy) always positive (Ned)		good (Ike) well received (Ivy) positive (Ian)
Conferencing		positive (Nancy) always positive (Ned)		excellent (Ike) well received (Ivy) positive (Ian)
Models		positive (Nancy)		neutral (Ike) well received (Ivy)
Networking		mixed (Ned)		good (Ike) well received (Ivy)
Research		mixed (Ned)		very good (Ike) well received (Ivy)
Group work		mixed reactions (Nancy) mostly positive (Ned)		excellent (Ike) well received (Ivy)
Visual--Film		positive (Nancy)		
Personal Experience		positive (Nancy)		
Mapping or webbing		positive (Nancy)		
Drafting Strategies	N=2		N=1	
Listing		mostly positive (Norm) positive (Ned)		fine if used sparingly (Ike)
Outlining		mostly positive (Norm) positive (Ned)		depends on student (Ike)
Notes		mostly positive (Norm) positive (Ned)		used sparingly, not effective (Ike)
Idea Hordes		mostly positive (Norm) positive (Ned)		fine if used sparingly (Ike)
Focus		mostly positive (Norm) positive (Ned)		
Point of View		mostly positive (Norm) positive (Ned)		
Revision Strategies	N=1		N=1	
Assignment rewrites		generally positive (Norm)		good where they see a reason (Ike)
Sentence rewrites		generally positive (Norm)		neutral (Ike)
Checking for structure markers		generally positive (Norm)		neutral (Ike)
Rhetorical revisions		generally positive (Norm)		depends on purpose (Ike)
Error analysis		generally positive (Norm)		

These same three strategies were noted as receiving positive student reaction by implementers, however. Two possible reasons are suggested. First, during the interview, Ike pointed out that many of the writing strategies do not have to be taught at the high-school level since students have already received training at the elementary grades. As a result, students know how to use these strategies and are comfortable with these strategies. Second, implementers are more familiar with these strategies than non-implementers and may have a better understanding of when and how to use them in the classroom, thereby minimizing student frustration.

For drafting strategies, student reaction was seen as positive by the two non-implementers who responded. However, the implementer who answered this section suggests that student reaction to listing, notes, and idea hordes was favourable only if the strategies were not over used, and that student reaction towards outlining varied, depending on the student. This may indicate that teacher judgement needs to be exercised in the use of drafting strategies. Not all drafting strategies can be expected to be useful to all students all of the time. They are of benefit only under certain conditions, and the teacher needs to be aware of these conditions.

One implementer and two non-implementers noted student reaction for revision strategies. The degree of enthusiasm in student reaction declined from prewriting through to revision for both groups. Ike saw his students as acting generally positively towards all revision strategies, whereas, Ned maintained, "it was difficult to generalize" as he found student "reaction to revising exercises varied greatly." Ike, on the other hand, felt that student reaction was positive for two of the strategies but only if certain conditions were met. Student reaction for assignment rewrites was good if they could see a reason for it, and student reaction towards rhetorical revision depended on the purpose of the rhetorical revision.

e. Suitability of Writing Strategies for Certain Grades and Writing Assignments

Teachers were asked to note which writing strategies worked best at what grade level and for which particular type of writing assignment. Only one implementer commented on appropriateness of writing strategies for various grades whereas three non-implementers responded for prewriting, one for drafting but none for revision. This is shown in Table 8 which presents comments made by non-implementers and implementers regarding which writing strategies worked best for which grade.

The non-implementers and implementers who responded for prewriting strategies did perceive certain prewriting strategies as working best for specific grade levels. The only difference between the two groups occurred for conferencing. One non-implementer perceived it as appropriate for junior grades whereas one implementer felt it was appropriate for senior grades.

Ike's tendency to use strategies at specific times when he judges them to be appropriate, rather than associating them with specific grades as does Ned, is shown in the comment he made for drafting and revision strategies, "all strategies work well when used at the right moment with any grade level I've experienced (8-12)."

So, according to one implementer, the prewriting strategies conferencing and research tend to be grade specific whereas drafting

Table 8
Suitability of Writing Strategies for Grade

Prewriting Strategies	N=3	Non-Implementers	N=1	Implementers
Brainstorming		- junior grades (Nick) - grade 8 and 9 (Nancy) - group brainstorming works well for weaker students (Nancy) - grades 8 and 9 ; grades 10, 11, 12 see it as unnecessary (Ned)		
Listing		- junior grades (Ned)		
Conferencing		- for weaker students (Nancy) - junior grades (Ned)		- senior grades (Ike)
Models		- work well for less academic classes (Nick)		
Research		- grades 10, 11, 12; grades 8 and 9 impatient with the demands of research (Ned)		- senior grades (Ike)
Drafting Strategies	N=1		N=1	
Idea Hordes		- grades 8 and 9 (Ned)		- all strategies work well when used at the right moment with any grade level I've experienced (8-12) (Ike)
Focus		- grades 11 and 12 probably because by then they are ready to receive and work on such strategies (Ned)		
Point of View		- grades 11 and 12 probably because by then they are ready to receive and work on such strategies (Ned)		
Revision Strategies	N=1		N=1	
		- most students are impatient with the task of revising; junior students are particularly reluctant to change anything in their first draft; senior students often believe they're revising when in fact they're merely making a neater copy (Ned)		- all strategies work well when used at the right moment with any grade level I've experienced (8-12) (Ike)

and revision strategies can be applied to any grade. However, teacher judgement is required so that the most helpful strategy can be used at the right moment.

As can be seen in Table 9, both implementers and non-implementers, when asked to indicate writing strategies that worked

Table 9
Suitability of Writing Strategies for Assignment

Prewriting Strategies	N=3	Non-Implementers	N=2	Implementers
Brainstorming		- expository and for paragraphs written in reaction to poems, short stories and novels (Ned) - literary analysis, critiques, comment and reaction (Norm)		
Listing		- expository and for paragraphs written in reaction to poems, short stories and novels (Ned) - literary analysis, critiques, comment and reaction (Norm)		- expository (Ike)
Conferencing		- expository and for paragraphs written in reaction to poems, short stories and novels (Ned)		- creative writing assignments (Ike)
Models		- letter writing (Nick) - longer senior essays (Nick)		
Research		- literary analysis, critiques, comment and reaction (Norm)		
Mapping or webbing				-expository (Ivy)
P.M.I.				- expository (Ivy)
Visualization				- creative expression (Ivy)
Revision Strategies			N=1	
				- all strategies work when the right moment arrives (Ike)

better for particular writing assignments, responded only for prewriting strategies, except for one implementer who also responded for revision. Non-implementers have more in common than implementers. Two non-implementers indicated brainstorming and listing as being more effective for expository writing. Not only do two non-implementers give similar responses for brainstorming and listing, they also basically perceive certain prewriting strategies as being useful for expository writing. Implementers, on the other hand, also specify creative writing as well as expository writing.

Implementers do not appear to classify certain strategies with certain assignments as do non-implementers. Perhaps non-implementers tend to assign expository writing frequently and therefore look for strategies which support it.

2. Expansion of Audience

In the area of audience expansion (assigning topics targeted for different audiences, and readership beyond the teacher), there appears to be little difference between the two groups. Student writing, on the whole for both groups, appears to be limited to the school. However, one implementer had extended audience and readership beyond the school.

Three non-implementers said they expanded the reading audience of their students. Norm considered expansion to mean reading selected student writings to other students, but he did not say if the intended audience of the writing was someone other than himself. Nancy just said her students developed an "awareness of appropriateness" which appears to suggest that her assigned writing topics were meant for different audiences and that her students did realize that they needed to vary their writing styles for different audiences. However, she did not say for whom her students wrote, nor if others read her students' writings. According to Nancy and Norm, students did their best writing for the teacher. Ned is the only non-implementer who appears to have encouraged his students to "relate to a larger community" (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985, p.118). Ned gave topics that demanded different writing styles because they were intended for different audiences. His students began "to consider how writing styles may be (rather than must be) dictated by the target audience." He appears to make consideration of audience part of instruction. Ned stated that his students did their "best writing for other classes (for their peers)" which suggests that students not only wrote for others, but also that their work was read by others.

Norm was the only non-implementer to point out a perceived problem. The problem, however, was not with audience expansion, but rather with writing as a process. He stated "there is not enough time" in regular English classes "for a complete writing process approach." He made this comment a number of times in the questionnaire.

Three of the four implementers also responded to this part of the questionnaire. Ike indicated only that "yes," he expanded the reading audience and he "began more consciously to understand that teachers and students are not the only audience." However, he did not say what was done to expand the reading audience. Irene had her students read their work out loud and respond in small groups, and writing was put on display. The readership therefore extended beyond the teacher. However, she did not say if the writing assignments themselves were intended for different audiences. The problem she cited was not a problem associated with the act of writing; rather it was one that seems to be fairly typical of students--getting them to share. Even though her students shared writings and received feedback from others, Irene's senior students wanted teacher reaction. Ivy, like Ned, seems to have used the idea of audience in the way it was intended in the questionnaire, but Ivy took it a step further than Ned in that her students' writings are read by those for whom they were intended. "More careful proofreading" is the benefit she gave for this expansion of reading audience, and students produce their best writing for (in order of priority): "teacher, newspaper, letters to the government."

For both groups, audience is still limited to the classroom and, at best, the school (Ivy's students, being the only exception). Once again there does not appear to be much difference between the two groups. Only one implementer and one non-implementer made it clear that they use writing topics targeted for different audiences. Two non-implementers and two implementers have gone beyond just the teacher as reader, while only one implementer has clearly extended audience as well as readership outside of the school.

3. Writing Conferences

Teachers were asked to indicate the nature of writing conferences in their classrooms before and after they attended the workshop, the benefits of workshop writing conferences strategies, problems they encountered when using strategies, and where they learned new conferencing strategies.

Only one respondent (an implementer) replied to two of the four questions. Ivy named four benefits of writing conferences: "more writing, positive climate, enthusiasm, more cooperation." It is interesting that she did not cite improved student writing as one of the benefits; rather the benefits tend to be more of a change in student attitude towards writing. She also indicated she had access to sources other than the workshop for information and support. These sources were: "mentoring groups, school member of district writing committee, language across the curriculum." The groups Ivy mentioned appear to be organized groups, that is teachers coming together for a purpose rather than on an ad hoc basis.

4. Writing Assignments

Teachers were asked to indicate the frequency various types of writing assignments were assigned before and after the workshop, and to identify workshop-related writing assignments they had tried which had proven to be successful or unsuccessful, as well as, if they considered any of the workshop writing assignments to be incompatible with the British Columbia English curriculum.

As can be seen in Table 10, which displays the frequency (never, rarely, sometimes, frequently) which non-implementers and implementers assigned certain types of writing assignments before and after they attended the workshop, there was not much change within the two groups, nor are there any substantial differences between the two groups.

Of the three non-implementers, one indicated the frequency of assigning types of writing assignments remained constant. Another did increase the frequency of assigning expressive and creative writing after attending the workshop, while a third member decreased the frequency of assigning business writing after attending the workshop. Practically no change occurred for implementers. Ivy maintained she assigned all types of writing before and after the workshop (she did not cite frequency of assignments). Irene said there was no change in the frequency of writing assignments; rather it was her approach in teaching that changed. Ike was the only implementer to indicate that a change occurred. However, this change appears to be slight, since creative writing went from "frequently" to "sometimes to frequently." Between the two groups, little difference appears to exist, except perhaps in essay writing which appears to be the preferred writing assignment for non-implementers both before and after the workshop. Only one non-implementer said he used workshop-related assignments in his classroom ("a personal moment of horror (fright), a childhood memory").

Table 10
Frequency of Types of Writing Assignments

	Before Workshop		After Workshop	
Types of Writing Assignments	Non-Implementers N=4	Implementers N=3	Non-Implementers N=4	Implementers N=3
Essay	frequently (3)	frequently (1) sometimes (1)	frequently (3)	frequently (1) sometimes (1)
Expressive	rarely (2) frequently (1)	frequently (1) rarely (1)	rarely (1) frequently (2)	frequently (1) rarely (1)
Creative	rarely (1) sometimes (1) frequently (1)	frequently (1)	rarely (1) frequently (2)	sometimes to frequently (1)
Business	sometimes (1) rarely (2)	rarely (1) sometimes (1)	rarely (1) sometimes (1) never (1)	rarely (1) sometimes (1)

Note. The numbers in brackets refer to the number of teachers who made that comment.

No workshop writing assignments were seen as incompatible with the B.C. curriculum. But one non-implementer, Norm, does see writing as a process as being incompatible:

> In a general English class there is not enough time for a complete writing-process approach. In a writing class there is too much time and insufficient substance (for me). In a Literature course there is no time.

Norm sees the problem as time, while Ike, an implementer, does not have that problem. Is the difference a perception of what they see as teacher and student role or, has it to do with what they see as their job in the classroom? It also appears that Norm does not consider it as part of his domain to teach writing in the global sense in an English class since there are too many other things to do. Ian (an implementer who was teaching junior secondary at the time), on the other hand, felt that teaching writing, including writing in relation to literature, was part of his job.

F. Teaching of Writing After

When implementers and non-implementers talked of their teaching of writing after they attended the workshop a number of differences became apparent between the two groups. Differences between the two groups were noted in the extent of change, causes of the change, and problems that were encountered when changes were made.

Although non-implementers did add to and modify some aspects of their teaching methodology, little change overall appears to have occurred. Prewriting activities were used, and discussions about the topic became longer. One non-implementer (Nick) gave more class time to students to prepare for assignments. They would work in small groups discussing and writing down ideas. However, it would appear that the work Nick would have students do in a small group is based on a traditional approach. He would give out a sheet of two hundred questions (based on a novel that had been read and discussed and that the writing was to be in response to) which were grouped into sections. The students answered five or six questions in each section. The questions were geared to an essay they would have to write. More time was also given in class for writing, and one teacher who had been using peer group editing said they occurred more frequently and became more "formalized." Another teacher would sometimes have students in one class read and write comments on the anonymous drafts written by students in another class. Non-implementers appeared to have taken those ideas that they believed to be helpful, and could be adapted to fit their teaching approach. As one teacher commented, "I ask others what works for them; I'll modify it, and it will work for me." It appears that the strategies non-implementers did adapt were ones to be used when the assignment was given, and when the assignment was being readied to be handed in.

Three implementers, however, appeared to have made extensive changes in their teaching of writing. Following the workshops discussion was held prior to writing, prewriting strategies were suggested, more writing took place in class, conferences occurred, and drafting and revision strategies as deemed appropriate to the situation were used. Students were also made part of the instructional process. They were encouraged to generate their own topics, asked to give suggestions for assignments, and they were trained in conferencing and editing skills so that they could conference with each other and edit each other's work. Opportunities were provided for different kinds of writing, and the reading audience was expanded beyond the teacher, although to a lesser degree at the senior English level than at the junior level. Two implementers noted that a change occurred in the relationship between themselves and their students which they summarized as follows:

> The politics in the classroom have shifted, that's probably the biggest change . It's a much more student centred approach. I suggest an assignment, and then they can generate their own topics in terms of writing that is. They have a lot of input as to the criteria of the evaluation, who they are going to work with, what types of groups, and they set deadlines. (Ian)

> . . . when you use the writing process your relationship with the students changes in the sense that you and the students feel you are doing something real. (Ike)

When implementers talked of how their teaching changed, they compared it with what they had done before. Non-implementers did not compare their past with their present so much as they tended to say "did more of," and "be inclined to." It appears that implementers changed what they did to such an extent that they could see what they had done before as being quite different.

However, two implementers pointed out that although their way of teaching "drastically changed," their way of thinking had not. They appear to imply that one reason they were able to accept writing as a process was because the beliefs and assumptions underlying writing as a process were in accordance with their own way of thinking. Ian stated that when he filled out a workshop questionnaire he found that his "traditional approach did not necessarily jive with everybody else's." He also stated that even though he perceived his previous teaching method as "teacher-directed" he believed that the notion of "student-directed" was something he always had. Nor, that he found it difficult using the strategies he had learned about as they "slid right in," and this, he maintained, was possible because he "had a tree to fit it to all along." Ike tended to echo much the same idea that Ian expressed. Ike found he "automatically empathized" with writing as a process since he "has always been a process person."

Of the four implementers, Ivy, the only implementer who maintained she had used the process approach throughout her career, appears not to have made extensive changes. Although she continued to do what she had done before, she stated she did add to and modify some aspects of her teaching. She no longer felt it necessary to assign a grade to all written work; at times she would provide written comments; nor did she, any longer, demand that all written work be brought to the presentation stage. These modifications she credited to the writing workshop.

For most of the non-implementers, causes of the changes they made appear to have arisen from their classroom context. Nick stated that by 1980 he had "reached a low point in his career" and was looking for new methods, "something that would work." Ned maintained the changes he made were "mostly dictated by the kids themselves . . . because of what the kids had written." Nancy assigned more writing in class so she could provide students with assistance in editing as "they don't know the error." Norm, however, credited the writing workshop for the new ideas he used.

All implementers, however, credited sources outside of the classroom for being the causes of the changes that they made. These sources include: the writing workshop, the district coordinator (who was Irene), the district writing committee, literature from England, and the Canadian Council of Teachers of English conference held in 1981 at the University of British Columbia. One implementer also pointed out the questioning of his students as another contributing cause.

Non-implementers encountered a number of problems when they first tried writing as a process or aspects of it. For Ned, the problem was not enough knowledge. The workshop had not provided enough examples, and, as he stated, he had been preoccupied with concern over the reading he would have to give of the writing he had done during the workshop. Norm maintained there was no time in senior English for this approach, and not enough time in a regular English class. Norm, also expressed very definite views concerning what the teaching of English was about:

> Essays, drama, poetry, prose, novel and grammar, all of those of course you are dealing with something which is real. Great philosophers, great writers, they have something to say to us; they are shooting real bullets. You don't do Shakespeare because he is Shakespeare, and because it is a school requirement; we do it because he has something to say to us. And this is what the teaching of English is about, not writing as a process.

When Norm did try using writing as a process in a composition class, he found "the first three months were fine, then the kids got bored because I got bored." Nick stated when he first started using the process approach the problems that occurred were ones beyond his control such as, "the overhead did not work, unanticipated interruptions occurred (e.g., field trip, assembly), and "someone has the television." He appeared to suggest that it required a fair amount of personal energy to do, that is, "you have to be turned on to do it; you have to get yourself up." Nick could not adopt writing as a process, only adapt some of the characteristics "to suit" himself. He appeared to imply that the approach was not structured enough when he stated that there needed to be "parameters, boundaries for kids to work within, after all, creativity is discipline." For Nick and Norm, it appears that a major problem with writing as a process is that it did not fit with their perceptions of what should be occurring in the English classroom, or with how they saw themselves as teachers.

Implementers also encountered problems, but they appear to be problems of a different nature. Like Nick, Irene found she could not "straight away adopt" writing as a process strategies. She, also, had to adapt them. But the adaptations she made were not done to suit herself; rather, they were adapted to suit her different classes. Other problems encountered include initial increase in classroom noise, student resistance, and parental confusion. Two implementers, also noted that evaluation had been a problem. Evaluation could no longer be based on the final product now that what students did as they wrote was also considered to be of importance. As Ian pointed out, "the process approach was opposed to the model of evaluating" that they still had. There is the sense that, rather than trying to make the innovation fit within the tradition of the English classroom, the implementers, having decided that this approach "was the way to go," encountered the type of problems which can occur when the existing classroom context is being changed to accommodate something new.

Nor did the problems implementers encountered appear to interfere with their commitment to writing as a process. Their commitment is shown not only in the extent of changes they made, and in the time and effort that must have been provided to make such changes, but also in the work that they did as members of their district writing committee. For example, to facilitate the fit of writing as process with curriculum they designed their district's grade 10 writing assessment which was modelled on the writing as a process approach:

> We decided we were going to test narrative in the fall, and so we gave a topic and this was to be used in the classroom over about a week because we insisted that writing had to go through the whole process. We provided material for prewriting and then there was to be drafting. They couldn't take the stuff home, everything had to be done in the classroom. But they had to draft, revise final copy, and so on. We set it all up in this package that went to all the grade 10 teachers. (Irene)

This example indicates their commitment to this approach, and demonstrates that the implementers perceived that aspects of the school structure needed to be, and could be, adapted to accommodate this innovation.

G. Personal Background Information

Other than Irene's position as a district coordinator, there is little difference between the two groups in terms of university education, years of teaching, and administrative experience. The major difference between the two groups occurred in teacher organizations. Most non-implementers did not belong to organizations other than the mandatory ones (B.C.T.F. and local organization), whereas implementers did belong to other teacher organizations (e.g., British Columbia Teachers of English Association) as well as the mandatory organizations.

All non-implementers have a Bachelor's Degree; three have a Bachelor of Arts and one has a Bachelor of Education. Only one person stated that he had an English major. Two members hold a Master's Degree (one in Arts and one in Education). Total teaching experience for this group came to ninety-one years. Only one member held an administrative position (English Department Head) at the time he attended the University of British Columbia Language Education writing workshop.

All implementers hold a Bachelor of Arts Degree; three majored in English and one in Latin. No members have a Master's Degree. Total teaching experience is slightly lower at eighty-one years. However, two members held administrative positions (English Department Head and District Coordinator for secondary English) at the time they attended the workshop.

Non-implementers had been teaching a minimum of six years before the first recorded (in this group) time of workshop attendance and a maximum of twenty-eight years. Implementers had been teaching a minimum of five years and a maximum of twenty years before the first recorded (in this group) time of workshop attendance.

The differences between these two groups are slight and there is nothing in terms of university education, years teaching or administrative experience, except for one implementer's (Irene), position as District Coordinator, that suggests itself as a deciding factor for or against implementation. It was assumed that teachers with a background of English university courses would emphasize the study of literature and predominantly assign essay writing based on literature, for as Mussio (1979) points out:

> . . . obtaining a degree in English really means--at least in British Columbia--getting a degree in English literature. If you review university calendars you will find that the majority of English courses taken by high school teachers were designed to foster an understanding of the writing of other authors. Very few of their courses are designed to extend future teachers' abilities to teach writing. So when that person is assigned to teach high school English, his primary interest likely is the teaching of literature. (p. 5)

However, it is the implementers who point out their English majors. The only other difference is the master's degrees held by non-implementers. We might wonder what non-implementers learned during their master's studies and if what they learned impacted on their teaching. But as Fullan (1982) maintains:

> Research on teacher characteristics and effective change is inconsistent in its findings. Level of education (e.g., possession of a master's degree) and years of teaching experience are two variables frequently measured in research studies. The results vary, and it is not difficult to see why, given the other factors in chart 2. It is not level of education or years of experience that matter so much as under what district and school conditions teachers spend their time. Depending on the conditions, innovators and hard-core resisters are found among all ages and levels of education. (p. 72)

However, there is one item that does noticeably separate the two groups--teacher organizations. Of the non-implementers, Norm is the only one who belongs to a teacher organization other than the mandatory ones (BCTF and local teachers' organization). He also belongs to NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English), BCTEA (British Columbia Teachers of English Association) and CCTE (Canadian Council of Teachers of English). Norm is active in his profession. On the other hand, all implementers belong to organizations other than the mandatory ones: BCATML (British Columbia Association of Teachers of Modern Languages), NCTE, CCTE, BCETA and their district's English Curriculum Committee. They, too, are active members of their profession. Membership in such groups suggests interest in what is happening in their fields.

Members of both groups (except for one non-implementer) indicated they read journals connected with the teaching of English. An examination of the journals B.C. English Teachers' Association Journal, Update, and English Education from 1977 to 1981 shows that a number of articles concerned with the teaching of writing (Allen, 1980; Bristow, 1978; Coe, 1977; Ediger, 1979; Lange, 1979), writing as a process or an aspect of it (Bristow, 1980; Burke, 1981; Butler, Morris, Weathermon, Wilson, & Van Ginkel, 1980; Church, 1979) and suggestions concerning implementation (Lange, 1981; Watson, 1981) were published. The literature, on the whole, was supportive of writing as a process and may have contributed to a climate, or a feeling in the air, that here is an approach to the teaching of writing that solves a number of problems. However, the literature, although necessary, is not in itself sufficient for implementation. How useful these articles were depends upon to what degree they were critically read and discussed, and their ideas tried.

H. Summary

In a number of respects implementers and non-implementers do appear to be similar. All were experienced teachers who, on the whole (except for one implementer) had similar approaches to the teaching of writing before they became aware of writing as a process as presented at the writing workshops they attended. Both groups perceived problems in the teaching of writing, and in their own ways tried to address these problems in their classrooms. All attended the UBC writing workshops, but appeared to have learned of various strategies from other sources. Non-implementers and implementers did apply, in their classrooms, to varying degrees, what they had learned and did encounter problems as they made changes.

Yet, within these general similarities differences did appear to exist between the two groups. Most implementers and non-implementers had similar teaching approaches prior to attending the workshop. However, three implementers talked of their teaching differently compared to the non-implementers. Instead of giving specific examples, they encapsulated their experiences in general terminology and contrasted it to what they were presently doing. Three implementers appeared to have distanced themselves from the way they had taught before. The non-implementers and one implementer (who maintained she had been using this approach without the labels throughout her career) did not give a sense of distance, but rather of continuity as they gave examples of their past and present teaching.

Although both groups did perceive problems in the teaching of writing, three non-implementers tended to be specific, perceiving the problems to be needed adjustments to various aspects of teaching, which they made efforts to do. For example, the problem of student reluctance to revise was addressed by one non-implementer by switching to another assignment rather than the student reworking the piece of writing. Implementers felt a general unease with what they were doing, but this appeared to have formed into a specific need to change the way writing was taught. However, for one implementer, it was that others should change their teaching methods.

The writing workshops appeared to have been more helpful to the implementers than to the non-implementers, even though both groups indicated they had learned most of the strategies they were aware of elsewhere. The workshop did not appear to offer what two implementers usually looked for (e.g., something quick and charming), but did appear to address the need of the implementers--another approach to the teaching of writing.

The data from the questionnaire appeared to imply that both groups were similar in their use of the innovation. However, this may be due to the small number of subjects participating in the study, and the questionnaire did ask teachers what they used, not how they used it. Non-implementers did indicate awareness of the strategies, but did not appear to indicate understanding of the idea underlying this approach. They appeared to have adapted certain strategies to fit within their methodologies, and with what they perceived to be the teaching of an English course. The strategies were basically used at the beginning, and at the end of writing. Three implementers did appear to make extensive changes so as to intervene in their students' writing processes. Importance was attached to, not only what students wrote, but also, what they did as they wrote.

In the process of making changes, both groups did encounter problems. However, it appeared the sources of these problems differed. As non-implementers adapted strategies to fit within their methodologies, and the existing structure of the classroom, problems with time, not enough knowledge, and equipment difficulties occurred.

Implementers encountered parental anxiety, student resistance, and evaluation dilemmas for in the process of shaping the reality of the innovation in the classroom they were also altering the context of the classroom.

The major factor which separates the two groups is district support. For the implementers, district support was manifested in a number of various aspects, whereas for non-implementers it appeared to be lacking. District support provided the initial impetus for change when the district coordinator (Irene) formed a committee to respond to the 1978 British Columbia Assessment of Written Expression. Out of the work of the committee arose the perceived need to change the way writing was taught. Writing as a process was regarded as meeting this need. Irene was credited by other implementers as being a visionary and a catalyst for change as she worked towards promoting writing as a process in her district. District support was evident in the funding provided to carry out this change. Implementers received ongoing inservice before and after the workshop as well as the support needed to implement writing as a process.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Introduction

This concluding chapter begins by examining the observed factors involved in implementation of writing as a process as undertaken by eight secondary English teachers. This section is followed by a section pointing out the limitations of the study. Suggestions for further research are then made and the concluding remarks reflect on the importance of district support in the implementation process which is the significance of the study.

A. Observed Factors Affecting Implementation

Implementation, the "how" of change is a complex, multidimensional process of putting something new into practice (Fullan, 1982). Implementation of an innovation may require changes to materials, pedagogical approaches, and beliefs and values if the desired effects of an innovation are to be achieved (Fullan, 1982). As Fullan (1991) points out, the identification of key factors which "form a system of variables that interact" (p. 67) is one method of characterizing implementation, and "has the advantage of isolating and explaining specific roles" (p. 67). In this study six factors are observed to have played a role in the implementation processes of eight teachers: district support, perceived need, beliefs, teacher knowledge, teacher interaction, and ongoing inservice.

2. Perceived Need

According to Fullan (1991), "identification of a need linked to selection of a program" is "strongly related to implementation" (p. 69). Most implementers were generally dissatisfied with their teaching of writing. Irene was not satisfied with her instruction which consisted of assigning writing, marking writing, and giving grammar lessons; Ian felt that his approach was "too teacher-directed, and teacher-in-control," and Ike expressed his sentiment as follows, "I always felt, since I began teaching, there was something wrong with the approach." The need arose from an outside source, but was fueled by the writing committee's work. Through their work as a group, which was formed to respond to a provincial writing assessment, implementers were able to identify and articulate the source of their uneasiness. What was needed was to change the way writing was taught. Writing as a process was seen as addressing this need.

Non-implementers did not indicate they saw the need to implement writing as a process as portrayed by the UBC writing workshops. Two members of this group stated they were already using a writing process approach, and two indicated this approach was not suitable for them.

3. Beliefs

For implementers, the beliefs underlying writing as a process appeared to be in accordance with their own. This is shown in their decision to adopt writing as a process and use many of its essential strategies and characteristics (e.g., peer group editing, peer group conferencing, assigning writing which includes a variety of writing modes in addition to expository, assuming a facilitative role) which

1. District Support

The implementers' district support structure was the major underlying factor of implementation of writing as a process. It was mentioned specifically by the implementers and was implicit in the other factors.

The initial impetus for change occurred when Irene, in her role as district coordinator, formed a committee to respond to the 1978 British Columbia Assessment of Written Expression. Irene endorsed writing as a process and was perceived as, "someone who believed in this philosophy, who had a vision, who thought this was worthwhile, and she was a force behind it." The implementers, as members of this committee, were committed to the improvement of the teaching of writing in their district, and worked towards establishing the use of this approach at all grade levels. This appears to be the "blending" of "top-down initiative and bottom-up participation" that is "characteristic of successful multilevel reforms" (Fullan, 1991, p. 83).

The district supported the work of this committee not only by providing funding needed for the district coordinator's salary, workshops, teacher release time, and the buying and publishing of materials, but also by enacting recommendations made by this committee. One such example was the district's grade 10 writing assessment, designed by the committee of which implementers were members, which was modelled on the writing process approach so as to facilitate the fit of district testing with writing process programs. Since the district supported the writing committee, the district was perceived as an advocate of this writing approach, and as a "writing district."

distinguish writing as a process from traditional approaches. Two implementers also made statements which appear to imply that the underlying beliefs of writing as a process were in more accordance with their own beliefs than the traditional approaches they had been using (which also may explain why they had felt a general dissatisfaction with what they had been doing):

> The basic idea that teaching of English was process rather than product has always been with me. . . . I never believed in the five paragraph essay. Although it was in the air and I unconsciously supported that way of thinking. . . . I automatically empathized with this method because I am a process person. (Ike)

> . . . from teacher to student-directed . . . is something I think I always had. . . . The very first thing we filled out were our views about writing, here are our notions about writing. We had to check what we agreed with and disagreed with. What I found was that my traditional approach did not necessarily jive with everybody else who was there. . . . It slid right in [referring to writing as a process]. . . . Very seldom did anything fail because I thought about it ahead of time before I implemented. I also had a tree to fit it to all along. (Ian)

The implementers' reactions to the workshop also appear to imply that they were in agreement with, or came to agree with, the principles being presented:

> It was like preaching to the converted. (Ian)

> It just reaffirmed my attitude and I just continued doing what I was doing. I guess the UBC workshop legitimized what I was doing or made legitimate what I was doing. (Ivy)

> I had a profound change in attitude and belief; it [the workshop] opened up a whole new area. (Irene)

Non-implementers were not able to accept the underlying beliefs held by this approach. Various members considered it too unstructured, could not see the value of a facilitative role or the value of some of the essential strategies such as peer group editing, and peer group conferencing. One non-implementer expressed the belief that only by reading his students' work could he learn what it was they needed to know. For Nick and Norm writing as a process did not fit with their perceptions of what should be occurring in the English classroom or how they saw themselves as teachers. Norm saw himself as an English teacher and this meant teaching literature not writing. He also had very definite views as to the form of writing that students should be using in their senior high school years:

> I feel that the students do enough of descriptive writing and narrative writing in the first ten years of their schooling. They are constantly doing it from grades 1 to 10. I think by the time they get to 11 and 12 they should be doing something real [referring to expository writing].

Nick expressed the belief that students needed "parameters" and "boundaries" which he did not see as being provided by writing as a process. Non-implementers' beliefs also affected how they adapted the writing as a process strategies they decided to use. An example of this was provided by Nick who adapted the prewriting strategy group work to fit his belief that students needed structure, and parameters to work within if they were to learn what Nick perceived as valuable. In preparation for writing an essay on a novel that had been read and discussed, students would work in small groups answering questions geared towards the essay.

4. Teacher Interaction

Implementers appear to have had a greater degree of interaction than non-implementers. Not only did implementers, like the non-implementers, discuss this approach with their colleagues, but some also arranged and/or conducted workshops. This demonstrates commitment to and knowledge about the innovation. Although non-implementers also indicated they discussed this approach with their colleagues, it is not known what the content of those discussions were. Implementers, however, belonged to an organized group that was committed to promoting writing as a process throughout their district.

As a group, these teachers met for purposeful reasons and were committed to the improvement of the teaching of writing. Through their work on this committee, implementers developed a sense of belonging (all used the word "we" when talking of the district writing committee). In the process of coming to understand the meaning of the innovation, they clarified their own interests and relevances, and were able to confirm or modify their own perceptions of what, as teachers, it was important for them to do. By creating their own writing programs (i.e., determining goals, creating materials, designing evaluation procedures) based on the writing process approach, they intimately understood and were committed to the changes they had made. The work that evolved from this group interaction was perceived as being ahead of its time--"pioneer work." The social context of the group, described as "high-powered", was able to maintain the energy and momentum needed so that implementation, which takes time, was ensured. This interaction that implementers were able to participate in was a positive factor in implementation of writing as a process.

The interaction that implementers participated in supports the notion that while the workshops do provide information and the practice of skills, teacher interaction during the process of implementation is also required. As Fullan (1991) points out:

> Teachers need to participate in skill-training workshops, but they also need to have one-to-one and group opportunities to receive and give help and more simply to converse about the meaning of change. (p. 132)

However, the type of interaction that takes place is also important. Little (1990) argues that while some forms of interaction can promote change, other forms of teacher interaction can contribute to the conditions of teacher isolation as described by Lortie (1975) and therefore maintain the present. She distinguishes between various forms of interaction by their ability to alter teacher isolation. She proposes that joint work, unlike storytelling, assistance, and sharing, is "dependent on the structural organization of task, time, and other resources" (p. 519), and "anticipates truly collective action--teachers' decisions to pursue a single course of action in concert or, alternatively, to decide on a set of basic priorities that in turn guide the independent choices of individual teachers" (p. 519).

5. Teacher Knowledge

Implementers appear to have had the knowledge of writing as a process and understanding of its underlying principles needed to implement this innovation effectively. Implementers, as members of their district's writing committee were involved in arranging and conducting writing workshops, publishing of materials, and designing of their district's grade 10 writing assessment which demonstrates not only knowledge of writing as a process but also commitment to this approach. Implementers indicated awareness of a number of writing strategies which they still used when intervening in their students' writing processes. Implementers also used characteristics which are essential to writing as process and which distinguish this approach from traditional approaches (e.g., peer group conferencing and editing). For three implementers what they had learned and used altered their teaching methodologies to such an extent that they could see what they had done before as quite different. This was seen in the way that they described their previous teaching such as through the use of such terminology as "teacher-directed" and by contrasting the way they had taught with their present approach:

> What you don't do is assign writing and say, "I want it at the end of the period," or "Bring it to me next period," or something like that. You don't do that. You do some sort of prewriting activity or discussion. At the very least, allow time for drafting in class. You may, depending on the time available, I have often collected students' drafts, and not with the idea of evaluating them at all, but just responding to them in some way making suggestions and all that kind of thing. You certainly emphasis the need for revision. (Irene)

Although non-implementers (as a group) indicated awareness and use of a number of writing strategies they did not convey (as the implementers did) a past and present picture of their teaching. Rather than compare their past teaching with their present they tended to say "did more of," and "be inclined to." Instead of using the knowledge of writing as process to create a different writing program (as was done by the implementers) they added to (e.g., longer discussions before writing, more writing in class) and modified various aspects (peer editing became more "formalized") of the methodologies they were already using. Non-implementers took those strategies which they identified as useful and could be adapted to fit their methodologies. Basically, the strategies chosen were those that would be used before writing began (i.e., longer discussions and prewriting activities), and at the end of writing (help with editing) when the work was readied to be handed in. Strategies essential to writing as a process (i.e., those involving students working with each other) were not used at all, used but then discarded, or adapted to fit their teaching styles.

6. Ongoing Inservice

Implementers, unlike non-implementers indicated they had been involved in continuous inservicing before and after they attended the writing workshops. Since writing as a process is a complex innovation, extensive retraining would be required for teachers who are aware of only the traditional approaches. What would be needed would be more than a three or five day workshop could provide. However, as members of their district writing committee, implementers had access to information and materials and more importantly the opportunities to work with others, to get involved in determining the meaning of writing as a process in a social context and to professionally develop. As Irene pointed out, in her role as district coordinator, she tried to ensure that teachers had what they needed in order to successfully implement writing as a process:

> I was able to involve other teachers and provide them with the time to become involved and I guess as they developed and grew so did I. We had the money to buy books to attend conferences, and to send people to conferences. It goes so much farther than the initial workshop.

For the implementers, the writing workshop was not an isolated occurrence but part of an ongoing process. There was not the type of inservicing which Fullan (1982) has noted as being ineffective in assisting implementation:

> Simply put, most forms of inservice training are not designed to provide the ongoing, interactive, cumulative learning necessary to develop new conceptions, skills, and behavior. Failure to realize that there is a need for in-service work *during implementation* is a common problem. (p. 66, his emphasis)

B. Summary

The major factor distinguishing the implementers and non-implementers was district support which was also manifested in the other factors. The initial impetus occurred when a district committee comprised of the implementers and other teachers was formed by Irene (who was a district coordinator at the time) in order to provide a district response to the 1978 British Columbia Assessment of Written Expression. The group's purpose may have begun small, but in the process of preparing their response, they came to the conclusion that what was needed in the teaching of writing was to change the way writing was taught, and the group's purpose expanded to the commitment to improve the teaching of writing in their district. Writing as a process was perceived as a solution for the need to improve writing programs. Most implementers (the exception being Ivy, who modified and added to her writing program) began the process of implementing writing as a process. That they were able to do so appears to have been substantially dependent on district support. District support was evident in a variety of aspects such as provision of a district coordinator who promoted awareness and implementation of writing as a process, ongoing inservice, encouragement of teacher participation, and the funding necessary to carry out these activities.

C. Limitations of the Study

1. The study was confined to three large urban districts and limited to only eight high school English teachers.
2. The generalizability of the findings is restricted by the method used to select the subjects. The teachers selected seemed representative of two groups of participants in the UBC writing workshops, but the subjects in this study were not randomly selected from these groups. Nor are the results generalizable to the implementers because the implementers themselves belonged to a subgroup, their district's writing committee.
3. The questionnaire and teacher interviews, of course, suffer from the problem of retrospective data gathering techniques. In this case, the problem was compounded by the fact that the data were collected by as much as nine years after the writing workshops were attended.

D. Recommendations for Further Study

During the course of this study, the following questions arose.

1. The teachers in this study who implemented writing as a process were all members of a district committee. Further study in the precise influence of such committees is warranted. For example, if implementers and non-implementers who were members of the same district committee could be found they could be compared to see what factors other than belonging to the committee were responsible for implementation. Or, alternatively, if implementers

were found who were not members of the committee, case studies might show which factors other than committee membership prompted implementation.

2. The implementers appeared to attach a fair amount of importance to the district writing committee (i.e., it was referred to as "high powered" and doing "pioneer work") of which they were members. What were the characteristics of this group which promoted the capacities to change of some or all of its members as well as promoting conditions for change within the district?
3. Some implementers and non-implementers appeared to suggest that they held certain beliefs which influenced the commitment they were willing to give to writing as a process. What teacher characteristics (e.g., curriculum orientation) influence teachers to implement, or not to implement, writing as a process?
4. Implementers noted that implementation of writing as a process, though prevalent throughout their district, was not as successful at the high school grades, especially at the senior levels. What are the conditions at the high school level which inhibit implementation?
5. One of the major thrusts in the writing workshops, which did not appear in the questionnaire or interviews, was that teachers model the act of writing in their classrooms. Do teachers, who have implemented writing as a process, write with their students?
6. Implementers appeared to have perceived the district coordinator as a motivating force in the implementation of writing as a process in their district. Further study into the characteristics and influence of such a district coordinator is warranted.

7. The length of time teachers need in order to be trained in this approach appears to be an important factor in the implementation process. Daniels and Zemelman (1985) describe their writing workshops as lasting a number of weeks and the implementers stated they received ongoing inservice after attending their initial workshops. How much ongoing inservice is needed so that significant change can be ensured?
8. One non-implementer maintained that his concern over the final reading of written work produced during the workshop distracted him from fully concentrating on what was being presented at the workshop. To what extent is it counterproductive for workshop leaders to announce at the beginning of the workshops that reading of participants' written work will occur at the conclusion of the workshop?

E. Significance of the Study

This comparative case study examined the factors which helped/hindered the implementation of writing as a process as undertaken by eight teachers of high school English. It demonstrated that district support played a major role in the implementation process of the group of teachers who implemented, which helps to explain why some teachers were able to implement writing as a process and others were not. This study noted that district support was apparent in a variety of aspects (e.g., district coordinator's advocacy, formation of a district writing committee, ongoing inservice) that, in concert with each other, enabled teachers to implement this innovation.

This study also reinforces the notion that workshops, in themselves, are not sufficient to guarantee that change will occur, nor that their effects will be lasting. Workshops, as with other forms of inservice, must be part of an overall change process. Workshops that provide theory, demonstration, and practice take into account teachers as learners, but teachers also require application with coaching and feedback, especially in the early implementation stages when difficulties occur. District support, as an integral component of the change process, can help to ensure that these requirements are met.

Bibliography

Allen, S. (1980). Teaching Composition: Perspectives. B.C. English Teachers' Association Journal, 22, (1), 14-16.

Alloway, E., Carroll, J., Emig, J., King, B., Marcotrigiano, I., Smith, J., & Spicer, W. (1979, February). The New Jersey writing project. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, The Educational Testing Program Service, and Nineteen New Jersey Public School Districts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED178 943)

Applebee, A.N., Langer, J., Durst, R., Butler-Nalin, K., Marshall, J., Newell, G. (1984). Contexts for learning to write: Studies of secondary school instruction. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Atwell, N. (1987). In the middle writing, reading, and learning with adolescents. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Belanger, J. (1985). Conflict between mentor and judge: Being fair and being helpful in composition evaluation. English Quarterly, 18, (4), p. 79-92.

Belanger, J. (1987). Dozens of composing activities for the classroom. Canadian Journal of Language Arts, 10, (1), 47-56.

Bertram, F. (1984). [Survey of participants' responses to writing workshops]. Unpublished raw data.

Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. (1963). Research on written composition. Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.

Bristow, D. (1978, September). An approcach to the writing assignment. Update, 20, (2), 9-10.

Bristow, D. (1980, March). The process approach to writing ... The Winterowd odyssey. Update, 21, (4), 7, 10.

British Columbia Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. (1978). British Columbia Assessment of Written Expression. Victoria: The Ministry.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (1982). Communications 11 and 12 resource book. Victoria: The Ministry.

Burke, G. (1981). English 12 Writing: Useless B.C. Test?. B.C. English Teachers' Association Journal, 24, (1), 16-17.

Butler, S., Ferguson, B., Morris, M., Weathermon, C., Wilson, J., & Van Ginkel, A. (1980). A sequential developmental program: Writing 8-12. B.C. English Teachers' Association Journal, 22, (1), 30-34.

Church, J. (1979, March/April). Another viewpoint on composition. Update, 20, (5), 7.

Clifford, J. (1981). Composing in stages: The effects of a collaborative pedagogy. Research in the Teaching of English, 15, (2), 37-53.

Coe, R. (1977). Writing skills: White Collar Control. B.C. English Teachers' Association Journal, 19, (1), 17-25.

Daniels, H. & Zemelman, S. (1985). A writing project: Training teachers of composition from kindergarten to college. New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books Inc.

Doyle, W. & Ponder, G. (1977-78). The practicality ethic in teacher decision-making. Interchange, 8, (3), 1-12.

Ediger, M. (1979). Is your writing programme accountable?. B.C. English Teachers' Association Journal, 21, (1), 19.

Emig, J. (1971). The composing processes of twelfth graders. (Research report no. 13). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Freedman, S., Dyson, A., Flower, L., & Chafe, W. (1987). Research in writing: Past, present, and future (Tech. Rep. No. 1). Berkeley: University of California, Center for the Study of Writing.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. Toronto: OSIE Press.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Glatthorn, A. (1982, February). Maintaining momentum: Ensuring that the concern for writing is not one more educational fad. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English, Fort Worth, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 009)

Graves, D. (1983). Writing:Teachers and children at work. New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books.

Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. College Composition and Communications, 33, (1), 76-88.

Hayes, J.R., & Flower, L. (1983). Uncovering cognitive processes in writing: An introduction to protocol analysis. In P. Mosenthal, L. Tanor & S. Walmely (Eds.), Research in writing: Principals and methods (pp. 207-20). Don Mills: Academic Press.

Hillocks, G. (1986). Research on written composition. Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.

Huberman, A. & Miles, M. (1984). Innovation up close. New York: Plenum Press.

Lange, B. (1979). ERIC/RCS Report: Writing instruction for writing teachers. English Education, 11, (2), 121-125.

Lange, B. (1981). ERIC/RCS Report: Helping educators cope with change. English Education, 13, (2), 121-124.

Leithwood, K. & MacDonald, R. (1981). Reasons teachers give of their curriculum choices. Canadian Journal of Education. 6, (2), 103-116.

Little, J.W. (1990). The persistance of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. Teachers College Record, 91, (4), 509-536.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McLaughlin, M. & Marsh, D. (1978). Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, 80, (1), 69-94.

Murray, D. (1968). A writer teaches writing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Mussio, J. (1979). Insights from the inside. B.C. English Teachers' Association Journal, 20, (1), 4-7.

Odell, L., Goswami, D. & Herrington, A. (1983). The discourse based interview: A procedure for exploring the tacit knowledge of writers in non-academic settings. In P. Mosenthal, L. Tanor & S. Walmely (Eds.) Research in writing: Principles and methods. (pp. 221-36). Don Mills: Academic Press.

Olson, M. & DiStefano, P. (1980). Describing and testing the effectiveness of a contemporary model for in-service education in teaching composition. English Education, 12, (2), 69-76.

Sarason, S. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change. (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc.

Shaughnessy, M. (1977). Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wagner, B., Zemelman, S. & Malone-Trout, A. (1981). The Chicago area writing project asessment. Elmhurst, IL: School District 205.

Watson, S. (1981). Teachers into action: Heart of writing project's success. English Education, 13, (2), 86-92.

Werner, W. (1980, June).Implementation: The role of belief. In M. Daniels & I. Wright (Eds.), Implementation Viewpoints (The Monograph Series, pp. 54-67). Vancouver: The University of British Columbia, Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction.

Werner, W. (1987). Training for curriculum implementation. Pacific Education, 1, (1), 40-53.

Appendix A

Department of Language Education Writing Workshop Outlines

1. Department of Language Education Composition Workshops

The following is taken from the information brochure "Intensive Workshops for Practising Teachers", written and distributed by the University of British Columbia's Department of Language Education:

Composition Workshops

Aims

- To translate recent theory and research into classroom practice.

  Over the past ten years, both the theoretical basis for teaching writing and methods used in the classroom have changed significantly. UBC's immersion workshops have helped bring these innovations to over 300 classrooms.

- To train workshop leaders who will return to their school districts and offer workshops to their colleagues.

  A recent survey of 64 participants from the first ten workshops revealed that 35 leaders had offered a total of 46 workshops, 18 in-school, 20 district, and 8 provincial.

Focus on Writing

Based on the principle that teachers of composition must experience the various stages of the writing process themselves, the workshops require every participant to draft, edit, and revise several pieces of writing, each of which illustrates principles discussed.

Workshop Topics

The topics covered in a typical five-day workshop include:

- the composing process
    - heuristics/invention, drafting, assessing, revising,and presenting
- writing to learn
- grammar and composition
- writing in various subject areas
- writing for ESL
- writing for examinations
- elements and strategies of forms
- technical writing
- assessment and evaluation

The workshops present recent theory and research in the teaching of composition and provide access to articles, reports, and video tapes.

Dates and Duration

Workshops are offered in February, April, May, June, August, and October with times adjusted to meet the needs of participating districts.

The normal pattern has been a five-day (Tuesday to Saturday) workshop, but the Department also offers an abbreviated three-day workshop and a one-day introduction to the composing process for school administrators.

2. New Westminister Secondary English Teachers Composition Workshop

The following is the outline of a composition workshop offered at a secondary school for English teachers:

1. Introduction

    A. Writing Activity #1 "Baltimore" - a writing derby
    B. The Writing Process

2. Coffee 10:15 -

    C. Sharing session -- the composing process
    D. Writing Activity #2 "Where did you learn to write?"
    E. Heuristics -- 10 to 20 ways teachers of English can generate writing
    F. Writing Activity #3 -- "Writing about a place of some significance"

3. Lunch 11:45-1:00

    Afternoon

    G. Heuristics 2
    H. Writing Activity #4 "A memo"
    I. Editing Workshop 1:45-2:15
    J. Revision (20 min.)

4. Presentation and Refreshments

Appendix B

Cover Letter Sample and Questionnaire

Dear Ian:

I would like to request your participation in a study that will describe the factors which helped or hindered the implementation of writing as a process, based on your participation in the UBC writing workshops. The study intends to address implementation by means of a questionnaire and a 35-minute interview.

The questionnaire and interview will focus on your implementation and use of writing as a process. Strategies you have used as well as difficulties and benefits you have experienced are of central concern to the study.

Your responses will provide guidance to workshop leaders as to what strategies have been shown to be useful in the classroom. The results of the study may also assist other teachers who may be considering implementation of this writing approach.

Participation in the study is voluntary. Your identity will remain confidential; no indentifying data will be released. All data will be destroyed upon completion of the study. Enclosed are the questionnaire, consent form and a stamped self-addressed envelope. If you will participate, please fill out the questionnaire and consent form and drop them in the mail. Upon receipt, I will contact you to request an interview which will be held at a time and place convenient to you.

Should you require further information please contact me, Anne Marie Mol, at 228-5313 (office) or 224-3701 (home).

I appreciate your co-operation and your willingness to take time from your busy schedule to help me with my project. Thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully yours,
Anne Marie Mol

(Consent form for questionnaire and interview mailed with questionnaire)

Consent Form

Project: Description of Factors Affecting Implementation of Writing as a Process

Researcher:
Anne Marie Mol
2505 Pearkes Lane
Vancouver, B.C.
V6T 2C3
224-3701 (home)
228-5313 (office)

Purpose: The questionnaire and interview will focus on your implementation and use of writing as a process. Strategies you have used as well as difficulties and benefits you have experienced are of central concern to the study.

Study Results: The results of the study may have implications for teachers considering the use of this writing approach. The results may also provide guidance for workshop leaders as to what strategies have been shown to be useful in the classroom.

The questionnaire should take no more than 30 minutes to complete. The interview will be approximately 35 minutes in duration and will be tape recorded if you consent.

PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY IS VOLUNTARY.

YOU MAY WITHDRAW AND/OR REFUSE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS AT ANY TIME.

YOU WILL NOT BE IDENTIFIED AND ALL DATA WILL BE DESTROYED UPON COMPLETION OF THE STUDY.

COMPLETION OF THIS FORM WILL BE CONSIDERED AS CONSENT TO USE THE DATA.

YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES YOU RECEIVED A COPY OF THE CONSENT FORM.

____________________	____________________
Signature of the teacher	Signature of the Researcher
____________________	____________________
Date	Date

I. Process Questions

A. PREWRITING

Please indicate by circling the appropriate response whether a strategy was learned before or after the workshop (i), or at the workshop (ii), its use in the classroom (iii), and comment (in a word or two) on student reaction to the strategy (iv).

Note: Wkshp refers to the UBC Department of Language Education writing workshop you attended.

Strategy	(i) Learned before or after wkshop	(ii) Learned at wkshp	(iii) Use in Classroom			(iv) Student Reaction
For example Brainstorming	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
1. Brainstorming	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
2. Listing	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
3. Conferencing	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
4. Models	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
5. Networking	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
6. Research	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
7. Group Work	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____

Please list other strategies not contained in the above list and respond to these in the same way

8. ____	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
9. ____	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
10. ____	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____
11. ____	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	____

1. If you circled 'did not use' (column 3) for any prewriting strategies (above), please indicate why you did not use those strategies. Use the strategy name or number to identify each.

2. If you circled 'no longer using' (column 5) for any prewriting strategies (above) please indicate why you no longer use those stategies. Use the strategy name or number to identify each.

3. For which prewriting strategies did you need more examples of than were provided in the workshop? Identify each by name or number.

4. If you circled no for 'learned at wkshp' (column 2) for any prewriting strategies (above) please indicate from where and/or from whom you learned of the strategy. Identify each strategy by name or number.

5. Did some prewriting strategies work better at one grade level than another? If so, at which grade level(s) and why? List each by name or number.

6. Did certain prewriting strategies work better for particular types of writing assignments? If so, which ones and for which assignments? Identify each by its name or number.

B. DRAFTING

Please indicate by circling the appropriate response whether a strategy was learned before or after the workshop (i), or at the workshop (ii), its use in the classroom (iii), and comment (in a word or two) on student reaction to the strategy (iv).
Note: Wkshp refers to the UBC Department of Language Education writing workshop you attended.

Strategy	(i) Learned before or after wkshop	(ii) Learned at wkshp	(iii) Use in Classroom			(iv) Student Reaction
1. Listing	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
2. Outlining	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
3. Notes	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
4. Idea Hordes	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
5. Focus	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
6. Point of View	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________

Please list other strategies not contained in the above list and respond to these in the same way:

8. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
9. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
10. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
11. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
12. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________

1. If you circled 'did not use' (column 3) for any drafting strategies (above), please indicate why you did not use those strategies. Use the strategy name or number to identify each.

2. If you circled 'no longer using' (column 5) for any drafting strategies (above) please indicate why you no longer use those stategies. Use the strategy name or number to identify each.

3. For which drafting strategies did you need more examples of than were provided in the workshop? Identify each by name or number.

4. If you circled no for 'learned at wkshp' (column 2) for any drafting strategies (above) please indicate from where and/or from whom you learned of the strategy. Identify each strategy by name or number.

5. Did some drafting strategies work better at one grade level than another? If so, at which grade level(s) and why? List each by name or number.

6. Did certain drafting strategies work better for particular types of writing assignments? If so, which ones and for which assignments? Identify each by its name or number.

C. REVISION

Please indicate by circling the appropriate response whether a strategy was learned before or after the workshop (i), or at the workshop (ii), its use in the classroom (iii), and comment (in a word or two) on student reaction to the strategy (iv).
Note: Wkshp refers to the UBC Department of Language Education writing workshop you attended.

Strategy	(i) Learned before or after wkshop	(ii) Learned at wkshp	(iii) Use in Classroom			(iv) Student Reaction
1. Assignment Rewrites	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
2. Sentence Rewrites	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
3. Checking for Structure Markers	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
4. Rhetorical Revisions	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
5. Error Analysis	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________

Please list other strategies not contained in the above list and respond to these in the same way:

6. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
7. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
8. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
9. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
10. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
11. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________
12. ________	yes no	yes no	did not use	still using	no longer using	________

1. If you circled 'did not use' (column 3) for any revising strategies (above), please indicate why you did not use those strategies. Use the strategy name or number to identify each.

____

____

____

____

____

____

2. If you circled 'no longer using' (column 5) for any revising strategies (above) please indicate why you no longer use those stategies. Use the strategy name or number to identify each.

____

____

____

____

____

____

3. For which revising strategies did you need more examples of than were provided in the workshop? Identify each by name or number.

____

____

____

____

____

____

4. If you circled no for 'learned at wkshp' (column 2) for any revising strategies (above) please indicate from where and/or from whom you learned of the strategy. Identify each strategy by name or number.

5. Did some revising strategies work better at one grade level than another? If so, at which grade level(s) and why? List each by name or number.

6. Did certain revising strategies work better for particular types of writing assignments? If so, which ones and for which assignments? Identify each by its name or number.

II. Content Questions

A. AUDIENCE

1. As a result of the workshop, did you expand the reading audience for your students' writing? In what way(s)? Please explain.

2. If problems occurred as a result of this expansion in reading audience, what were they and how were they resolved?

3. If there were benefits when your students wrote for different audiences, please identify each and comment on each.

4. For which reading audience(s) did your students produce their best writing? If two or more audiences, please list them in priority order.

B. WRITING CONFERENCES

1. If your students participated in writing conferences before you attended the workshop, identify each and briefly describe its nature.

2. If there were benefits when you used workshop writing conference strategies in your classroom, identify each benefit and briefly describe it or commment about it.

3. If problems occurred as a result of using certain writing conference strategies, what were the problems and how were they resolved? List each such strategy separately.

4. From where and/or from whom did you learn of any new writing conference strategies after you attended the workshop? List each separately.

C. WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

1. Please indicate, by circling the appropriate response, how frequently you assigned the following types of writing assignments to your students before you attended the workshop.

a. essay writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently
b. expressive writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently
c. creative writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently
d. business writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently

2. Please indicate how frequently you assigned the following types of writing assignments to your students after you attended the workshop.

a. essay writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently
b. expressive writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently
c. creative writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently
d. business writing:	never	rarely	sometimes	frequently

3. Name 3 types of workshop-related writing assignments which you found to be successful when you tried them with your classes.

____

____

____

4. Name 3 types of workshop-related writing assignments which you found to be unsuccessful when you tried them with your classes.

____

____

____

5. Did you consider any of the workshop writing assignments incompatible with the B.C. English curriculum? If so, please list those assignments by name.

____

____

____

____

III. Questions About the Workshop

1. Please circle the year in which you attended a writing workshop conducted by the University of British Columbia's Department of Language Education:

1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984

2. Please circle the duration of the workshop:

1 day 3 days 5 days

IV. Post-Workshop Interaction and Support

1. After attending the workshop did you:
(please answer yes or no)

a. conduct a writing workshop of your own ___________

b. arrange a writing workshop ___________

c. discuss this writing approach with your colleagues ___________

2. Please comment on the type of support you received from the following when you first began using this approach:

a. colleagues ____

____

b. English department head ____

____

c. school administrators ____

____

d. district administrators ____

____

e. others ____

____

V. Personal Background Information

1. Years of University:

2. Degree(s) earned, year in which degree(s) earned, and major(s):

3. Years teaching experience:

4. Teaching position held at the time you attended the workshop:

5. Present teaching position:

6. Administrative responsibility:

7. Teacher organizations you belong to:

8. Periodicals, journals that you read:
    a. regularly
    b. sometimes
    c. infrequently

Appendix C

Questionnaire Before Revisions

I. Background Information

1. Years of University
2. Degree(s) held
3. Years teaching experience
4. Teaching Position
5. Administrative responsibility

II. Process Questions

A. Prewriting

1. Prewriting Strategies Prior to Workshop

   a. Before attending the workshop what prewriting strategies did you use?

2. Prewriting Strategies Learned at Workshop

   a. What prewriting strategies given at the workshop were you able to use, why were you able to use them, and what were the benefits of using these strategies?

   b. Which prewriting strategies given in the workshop were you unable to use and why were you unable to use them?

3. Prewriting Strategies Subsequent to Workshop

   a. At this time, what prewriting strategies are you still using and why are you still using them?

   b. When did you stop using certain prewriting strategies and why are you no longer using them?

   c. What types of prewriting strategies did you need more of than were given in the workshop?

   d. From where/whom did you learn of any new strategies worth using?

4. Grade Level, Writing Assignments, and Student Reactions

   a. What prewriting strategies worked best for what grades?

   b. For what kinds of writing assignments did you use/not use prewriting strategies?

   c. What prewriting strategies suited what types of writing assignments?

   d. What were your students' reactions to the various strategies you used and did their reaction affect the continued use of these strategies?

B. Drafting

1. Drafting Strategies Prior to Workshop
   a. Before attending the workshop what drafting strategies did you use?
2. Drafting Strategies Learned at Workshop
   a. What drafting strategies given at the workshop were you able to use, why were you able to use them, and what were the benefits of using these strategies?
   b. Which drafting strategies given in the workshop were you unable to use and why were you unable to use them?
3. Drafting Strategies Subsequent to Workshop
   a. At this time, what drafting strategies are you still using and why are you still using them?
   b. When did you stop using certain drafting strategies and why are you no longer using them?
   c. What types of drafting strategies did you need more of than were given in the workshop?
   d. From where/whom did you learn of any new strategies worth using?
4. Grade Level, Writing Assignments, and Student Reactions
   a. What drafting strategies worked best for what grades?
   b. For what kinds of writing assignments did you use/not use drafting strategies?
   c. What drafting strategies suited what types of writing assignments?
   d. What were your students' reactions to the various drafting strategies you used and did their reaction affect the continued use of these strategies?

C. Revision

1. Revision Strategies Prior to Workshop

   a. Before attending the workshop what revision strategies did you use?

2. Revision Strategies Learned at Workshop

   a. What revision strategies given at the workshop were you able to use, why were you able to use them, and what were the benefits of using these strategies?

   b. Which revision strategies given in the workshop were you unable to use and why were you unable to use them?

3. Revision Strategies Subsequent to Workshop

   a. At this time, what revision strategies are you still using and why are you still using them?

   b. When did you stop using certain revision strategies and why are you no longer using them?

   c. What types of revision strategies did you need more of than were given in the workshop?

   d. From where/whom did you learn of any new strategies worth using?

4. Grade Level, Writing Assignments, and Student Reactions

   a. What revision strategies worked best for what grades?

   b. For what kinds of writing assignments did you use/not use revision strategies?

   c. What revision strategies suited what types of writing assignments?

   d. What were your students' reactions to the various revisions strategies you used and did their reaction affect the continued use of these strategies?

III. Content Questions

A. Audience

1. If a shift in audience for your students' writings occurred after you attended the workshop, please describe this shift in audience.

2. What problems occurred as a result of this shift in audience and how were they resolved?

3. What were the benefits when your students wrote for different audiences?

4. For what audiences did your students produce their best writing?

B. Conferences

1. If your students participated in conferences before you attended the workshop, what was the nature of these conferences?

2. After attending the workshop what conference strategies did you use and what were the benefits of using these strategies?

3. If problems occurred as a result of using certain strategies what were the problems and how were they resolved?

4. From where/whom did you learn of any new conferencing strategies after you attended the workshop?

C. Writing Assignments

1. What types of writing assignments did your students do before you attended the workshop?

2. After you attended the workshop what writing assignments were successful,and why do you think they were successful?

3. What types of writing assignments caused what problems, and how were these problems resolved?

4. What types of writing assignments do you think your students should be doing and do you think the approach taught at the workshop is conductive to these types of assignments. Why or why not?

Appendix D

Interview Guide

Basically in this interview I am interested in exploring two major areas. The first one deals with your teaching methods both before and after the time you became aware of the process approach. Were there any changes, what were those changes and what brought those changes about. The second one is concerned with how ideas generated by the university mesh with the reality of the classroom, for all too often the classroom reality is quite different from what is talked about in the university.

Part A

1. To begin with we could explore the way you taught writing before you became aware of the process approach.

   Probes:

   - What did a typical assignment look like?
   - What were students expected to do and how were they expected to do it?
   - What was the intention of the assignment?
   - What did you consider to be valuable that students should learn?

2. Did you ever feel changes were necessary in the way writing was taught?

   Probes:

   - Was there something you were dissatisfied with or did you feel there was something that needed to be changed in the teaching of writing?

3. Did what you learned about writing as a process offer any solutions to these problems?

4. Please describe how you teach writing now?

   Probes:

   - What does a typical assignment look like?
   - What are students expected to do and how are they expected to do it?
   - What is the intention of the assignment?
   - What do you consider to be valuable that students should learn?

5. Did major changes occur in the way you teach writing now in comparision to the way you taught writing before becoming aware of the process approach. What do you think caused these changes?

Part B

Quite often when new methods are introduced the realities of the classroom are rarely taken into consideration. Please reflect on the time when you first tried, in your classroom, some of the ideas you learned about writing as a process.

6. What problems did you encounter when you tried using this approach in your classroom?

   Probes:

   - Did the workshop provide enough examples, adequate practice?
   - Was the approach compatible/incompatible with students' needs, curriculum, teaching methods, timetabling?
   - What did you need more of than was provided in the workshop?

7. What effect do you think the workshop had on you?

   Probes:

   - Did changes occur in your attitudes, beliefs?
   - Did it confirm your attitudes, beliefs?
   - Did it precipitate changes in your teaching methods?
   - Can you provide examples?

8. Are there any comments, additions, changes you wish to make? Do you have any questions?

Appendix E

Transcript Sample

The following is provided as an example of the interview transcripts. It has been edited for mannerisms typical of conversational speech.

Ian:
You know, strategies like brainstorming, conferencing, and those things I had used a long time before, and it wasn't so I couldn't answer [referring to the questionnaire]. After a while it became redundant. I didn't even know what an idea horde was, outlining, well, I had done that a long time before. I was in the first workshop. I think it had to do with, at least it dealt mostly with full time English teachers, after that they branched out into socials and sciences where people weren't writing anyway.

Interviewer:
Wasn't that to do with writing across the curriculum?

Ian:
That I see as a natural branch from writing as a process. You just get into writing and before long you are into talking, into speaking, and then you see that it applies in other curricular areas as well. I was on the original Written Expression committee which was formed, I think, in 1978. The B.C. government had done a writing assessment and some of the recommendations--I think they made about thirty of them--were things like kids need more skill work, and work in grammar. They were applying the same preconceived ideas about writing based on the assessment. So we had a look at some of the research, and we had a look at what was happening in the way of composition, and we realized it was the approach that was wrong. We were beginning to realize there were two schools. One was a very traditional model. That is, teacher assigned topic, teacher took it home, marked it, teacher handed

it back. That is what I did. I use to mark it at home all the time and I was diligent about it. So before I even went to the Written Expression committee I was teaching writing but in the same traditional format. It was the only methodology that was being used.

Interviewer:
Think about the way you taught, before you became aware of the writing process approach. If you could give me a broad generalization of what a typical assignment looked like. What were students expected to do? How were they expected to do it?

Ian:
Well, as I said before, the approach was exactly the same as I had been taught--a teacher-directed approach. That is, I generated the topic. Several times I would give a choice of topics, but they were all generated by me. Students wrote them in class and without any consultation. Usually, it was teaching as testing and writing as testing. I would take it home, and edited it all, hand it all back, and expect them to have learned it. Some did, of course. Sometimes, they had to rewrite it and hand it back in. They had to make the corrections on it. Very seldom did they have to rewrite the whole thing, "Mechanical corrections. Give me an example. Detail needed here. Vary your sentence structure." And my teaching was basically a literature approach as opposed to sentencing, or how to add details. They wrote for me. Marking was heavy. It was like a labour of love.

Interviewer:
Some teachers say that by marking they really get to know the kids.

Ian:
I think they probably get to know the kids' responses to that topic. But, no, I don't think so. Kids were never allowed to bring their own experiences to the writing, and since they didn't generate the topic they were pretty well divorced from the writing itself. And there was a heavy dose of grammar.

Interviewer:
How was the grammar taught?

Ian:
Usually in isolation. Sometimes I made an attempt to integrate. It was usually mistake oriented. But I'll say I was a dedicated teacher of writing, as I am now. That hasn't changed, the approach has certainly changed. In fact, one of the reasons I had joined the Written Expression committee, was because they were trying to get together groups of teachers who were interested in writing. So we all, at least, had a common goal when we went to those workshops. It was like preaching to the converted.

Interviewer:
Did you ever feel changes were necessary in the way writing was taught before you become aware of the writing process approach?

Ian:
Well it was heavily work oriented, for me anyway. It was too much work. I think that probably the best teachers are the ones who are a little lazy. The lazier I become the more I delegate to students, and the more they do, I think, the more they learn. So my students do almost everything in terms of generating topics, and editing each others work, and I very seldom read a piece of work that's not been edited. They have to do a lot. Well, I jumped to the new strategies. In fact, I believe that with administrators too. (I worked with a very hard working administrator who did everything for us and we hated him. Any ideas he came out with we vetoed. But then I worked with one who was a little less diligent and we came up with all of the ideas, and he just patted us on the back, and we went off and worked harder for him.) In the earlier approaches, too teacher-directed, and teacher-in-control.

Interviewer:
But you had no real misgivings about the old way of teaching?

Ian:
No, well except that kids didn't seem to be doing any better.

Interviewer:
So despite all the work there was no real improvement?

Ian:
Well, I think there was superficial improvement, but I never got a sense the kids were extending vocabulary, or learning much about sentencing, or even taking that to their own reading.

Interviewer:
When you learned about writing as a process did you see it offering any solutions to the problem?

Ian:
I suppose so, yes. Initially, I saw it as a way of improving writing before it got to me to mark again. The strategies, for me, were not the best part of the workshop. For one thing, we had already had a lot of pre-training before we went.

Interviewer:
Where did the pre-training come from?

Ian:
Well, we first responded to the written assessment. We may have had ten meetings before the workshop, where we talked about the recommendations that the learning assessment branch had made, from these from the written assessment, and we knew that something was wrong in the recommendations, and so we had a lot of pre-discussion on it.

Interviewer:
Who was involved in these discussions?

Ian:

The committee, there were teachers from primary through senior high, and Irene. And we read the Bullet Report, Britton's book. So we read a few more theories about language. He actually came and spoke to us, yes, we had a very high powered group. We had some people come in after the committee went for about 3 years, and we wrote our own book. It was pioneer work in those days [79 through 82?] Yes. It was very exciting. It's gone into much broader scope from just writing as a process to teaching thinking skills, cooperative learning. I am the chairperson of the English Curriculum committee, and it gives me an opportunity to talk to all kinds of teachers in the district. We have got such a great elementary foundation in our district. It's all process, computers, cooperative learning, all the teaching for thinking, all that. So when we get them in junior high, those kids, they come with fairly good social skills as well as work skills, and it's very easy just to continue what they have been learning. We have a difficulty at the senior high which is very product, teacher-oriented, course-oriented, exam-oriented, and its just a matter of time for them. They are sort of like the dinosaurs. They haven't yet caught on. They stunt a lot of what has already gone on before. I think the provincial exams give an approach to the course that's unnecessary. I think that's teacher fault. It's a self-imposed, they don't fight the test so when they don't fight it they buy into it, and it's for 50% of their mark. Now I have seen the one in English 12, and it's a joke, nothing you can teach to. It's not even like teaching to the exam, which would be all right. I mean, you come with a good exam that tested a broad range of teachable items. But nothing is teachable. The section on fill in the blank--that's the first part--I think is worth 20 marks. It's basically a paragraph that somebody has removed, every nth word or so left, and a blank and given you three choices. Now the three choices are specifically designed to be so close that you really have to know what the author was trying to say. You have to edit someone else's work without opportunity to talk to the writer, and it's a meaningless task. There's nothing you can teach for. So 50% of the mark is based on some trivial stuff. I talked to some senior high teachers and they said they can only fight so much. We wrote a letter back the very first year but the provincial exams came about, and then that was all they did. And I said, if I was a senior high teacher I think my approach would have been two pronged. One, I would teach for the test, and I would fight the test, and they simply didn't believe that. So they bought into the whole product approach, and they like that, and that's just fine. But they better know that its only a matter of time. It's very information-based, content-based, and I think that's in direct opposition to thinking, at least the way thinking is going. Their writing is a strategy for thinking. The writing process parallels the thinking process.

Interviewer:
Could you describe your teaching now?

Ian:
The politics in the classroom have shifted, that's probably the biggest change. It's a much more student-centred approach. I suggest an assignment and then they can generate their own topics, in terms of writing that is. They have a lot of input as to what the criteria of the evaluation, who they are going to work with, what types of group. They set deadlines. But since the writing workshop I've gone on to teach a Social Studies 9, Consumer Education 10, and as a result of that I've been able to use the English based writing as a process in other curricular areas, which I think is absolutely invaluable in my own development. This has been the last five years. I am in a very going school, only eighty kids, four teachers. The students apply, and we interview them, and talk about what they are interested in--very motivated. They spend a lot of their time in independent studies, highly academic, but very collegial. They take responsibilities for teaching.

Interviewer:
On the assignments, do the kids work together?

Ian:
Yes, for the most part. They are all assigned editors. Students from grade 10 edit students from grade 8. A lot of cross grade, age, subject. In some subject areas we have varying ages - mini courses they spend

one of their independent studies in a mixed 8, 9, 10 where they met with their editors. And the editor helps them generate ideas, topics, outlines, and they are all trained to do that.

Interviewer:
Do you have to train the kids or do they come to the school with those strategies like the brainstorming, outlining, research strategies?

Ian:
No you train them. Grade 8, they all take a research skills mini course which involves going to the library, how to get information, how to make use of it, how to eliminate books. They do not need how to do outlines if that's what they need.

Interviewer:
So in terms of kids writings you take a look at the final product?

Ian:
No I'm involved all the way through.

Interviewer:
So you would --

Ian:
I'll give them specific as I tell the kids they have lots of people in the room that they can go to for specific. You know, for their problems, they don't really have to come to me. But when they come to me they have to have, "I want you to read this," in order to do this and they have to fill it in order to give me a better image for this, or, "Help me come up with an introduction," or, "Help me with the transition here." They are very edit specific. I will stop and do grammatical exercises all the way along. More often individually, sometimes the whole class, I'll just strengthen something. Do a lesson on singular subjects each and make sure all the antecedents agree. And I write down on a sheet as I mark where the difficulties are. I look at things like repetition of key words, repetition of sentence structures. And I'll teach a new

structure, a pattern, a new structure for them. I'll stop and teach subordination, coordination--all the kids know about T-units. By grade 10 they are talking like, "I started this work off with a series of sentence fragments that I put in a periodic sentence here because I wanted it to parallel the action, then I start with a short sentence subject verb." You know, they talk like that. I think its just a matter of training. They all have to read their work out loud. They have to read it aloud, sometimes in pairs, sometimes they take it home. I'll say, even read it to a wall if you have to read it out loud. I'll provide much more time for the process then I use to. My kids do more writing, much more peer evaluation. They would rather edit than almost anything else.

If you look at something like the district's writing project book, it's divided into several chapters that follow the process. There's prewriting, all of those stages what you do before, what you do during, what you do after. And if the book is lacking at all it's in the editing section. I always said right from the very beginning teachers don't have to know how to generate ideas, and they really don't have to be taught how to teach proofreading. What they need to do is have a look at the whole editing section. It is editing and revision where thinking is taking place and that's what the teacher used to do because it was an assumption that the kids couldn't do it. But, in fact they can. So how does it differ? My intervention is to teach, my intervention is no longer just grade or hand back a paper. I model a lot more.

Interviewer:
Do you write in class?

Ian:
Yes. But I don't always model my work. I don't think teachers have a very good idea of why they teach writing. I think they can give you an argument as to why they teach reading, but they don't have a very good sense of why they teach writing. They have a strange notion it is to produce a writer; somebody who writes. A writer writes. Very seldom does he or she need a teacher. But you just write, and you edit, you write, and you read, and you edit, and you become a writer. The teacher

interferes by giving the topic, by marking. So I have lots of small group editing sessions where kids read their work aloud in partners or in threes, and they have to respond to specific editing strategies. I teach editing on a basis of repetition. In grade 8, on the very first assignment, I ask them to look for repetition of sounds, and then repetition of key words. Then I might intervene to talk about how to use the thesaurus, how to find out other words, and how to avoid repeating key words because kids tend to have basic patterns. The next step from that is how to get emphatic repetition, how to encourage repetition. I can stop and teach parallelism. I can get them to look at the structures of sentences. Kids can say, "It just sounds right." Then I intervene to say, "Here's one of the reasons it doesn't. Here are sentences all subject verb and they are all about the same length. Let's see how we can extend the sentence." At that point I can teach subordination. So there's repetition of key words, and repetition of sentence length. I get them to look at the number of words per sentence that they tend to write, and then how to extend those. Even in the literature, that's what we would look for--that tie. Then I 'll go onto repetition of sentence structures. I stop and teach specific sentences: balance sentences, periodic sentences. Not so that they can remember it, or pick them out, but so they can use them. It is usually patterned sentences, you know, "Write like this." And I mark for specific editing. I give much more narrative, poems, plays as opposed to the essay. I tended to concentrate heavily on the essay before, now the essay comes towards the end of the grade 10 course. We are lucky in, our district that we have two district wide assessments one in November which is a narrative, and one in May which is a personal essay. So that parallels the grade 10 course in English well because it begins with characteristics of a short story and it ends with an approach to the essay.

Interviewer:
So you made changes to the way you teach writing. How did you find them succeeding in a regular school?

Ian:

Very well. I had 7 or 8 classes about 30 kids in each class and I did the same thing. Did some of the same things. I didn't have kids evaluate very much in those days. Now I turn a lot of the evaluation to them. What we will do -- the kids will say they need a whole class edit. Three or four kids will volunteer, and they read their work to the whole class. The whole class takes notes as they read. Nobody stops anybody. It's kind of interesting to watch. I sit in the circle, a little bit outside of the circle, and I take notes of what I would respond to in the work as it is being read. All the other kids take notes as well. It's probably the only time where I have absolutely no problem with keeping every kid on task. They love to edit. In fact I just read a little quote, "There's no passion like to edit somebody's draft." The kids sure like that. I'll sit at the back and make note of everything, from repetition of words to sentences to any image. I write about their introduction, conclusion, or I might even say the whole point of view is off, or the thesis is weak. So I give a response from a low level editing to highest level. Then I, or the student, fields responses to his or her work, and it has to be positive.

Interviewer:

Do you give an editing sheet to the students so they know what they are listening for?

Ian:

Yes, but at the end they can edit for anything. But they have had all sorts of editing sessions where they have had training in listening for key words, and listening for repetition of sentences. So by the end they are basically on their own. They field their own responses, and they say they get responses back from everybody. By the end of the year a lot of the preliminary positive stuff is out the window and people go right for the jugular. Which is all right once you've developed a climate where kids are free. They practice peer response; they have to build on the strengths of somebody's writing. By the end of the year they just say, "But they are such skilled writers. They are always good stories, or poems. But it needs some sharpening." The kids will respond, and I'll just check off what I've written. Very seldom do I have to make a comment, I just cross off when they come to the item that I've written down; that I would have talked about. Sometimes my page is very long, and theirs as well. What I do for the marks? I just collect all their editing sheets and take it home for homework. They have to change their shorthand into something I can understand what they are trying to say. They just can't say things like, "Oh, it is a good story." They have to say things like, "Oh, I particularly liked the vocabulary, this word, this word because . . . ." They are very skilled. And I think it is something everybody can do.

Interviewer:
You said that you learned a lot of these strategies prior to the workshop. Where did you learn them?

Ian:
Well, things like brainstorming, listing, and outlining are fairly traditional and I took those to my own writing all the way through school. I am a very list person anyway. Every day I have list of things that I do. I just organize myself. So I teach that as a study skill--usually in Social Studies. The things I learned at the workshop were things like conferencing. Now, what they suggested was the teacher to student conference which I did--very formal ones where kids would come up with their work and they talked about specific problems. But I found it took up way too much time. So now in my conferences I am almost telegraphic. I'll go around and I'll say, "You have a problem here, do this, " So my conferencing is very quick. It's not so formal, much more informal.

Interviewer:
So basically the major change was--

Ian:
From teacher to student-directed.

Interviewer:
Did you think that is something you always had in you or did something bring that about?

Ian:
No I think it is something I always had.

Interviewer:
You had a philosophy of how a classroom should be?

Ian:
There was conferencing as a specific strategy that I remember. One of the things they had which I think they [the workshop leaders] brought up was a questionnaire which was the very first thing we filled out. What were our views about writing? Here are our notions about writing. We had to check what we agreed with, disagreed with. I found was that my traditional approach didn't necessarily jive with everybody else who was there. By the end I think I would have answered differently on about 80% of the questions. But it was also overlapping I would hate them to justify the workshops based on this because I think their focus on the workshops now is entirely too narrow. They were on the process bandwagon along with a lot of other people, and so everybody seemed to be pushing process at that time. I don't think they got beyond understanding writing as a process. It went for me from writing as a process, to language as a process, to thinking as a process. Why the concentration on process? Because the world was going process. That the old product approach was industrial-based and the process approach is third wave. Even the research went process. I remember the very first bit of research that we read, had to do with process and that was Janet Emig looking into the way kids wrote. What they found was that process didn't necessarily jive with the product, so instead of fixing the product they began fixing the process. But the whole world was doing that, even the Japanese car manufacturers. Much more consensus approach to decision making. In cooperative behavior the small group interaction is much less dictatorial, much less authority centred and boss centred power. I think that's seen in the classroom. What is

heartening is how quickly its gotten into the classroom. The elementary classrooms in my district are all process. I've been into almost every single one of them recruiting students and what I've seen is nothing short of revolutionary. There was another thing in the workshop which I found very useful but which couldn't be repeated and that was a discussion on grammar from Ruth McConnell. She gave a three hour lecture which seemed to have gone by in twenty minutes. She talked about grammar 1, grammar 2 and grammar 3 which were sort of innate grammars, what kids already come with and it changed the way I looked at the teaching of grammar. It suggested a much more integrated approach to it. You certainly down-played its importance, the formal teaching of it. It was hard to argue with the research on it, and yet it is the stronghold of the English classroom. I think partly because it is a power thing. So I began looking at grammar and how it was being used. I adjust the teaching of it according to the patterns that were appearing in students' actual work. Another thing was the peer to peer work and widening the students' audiences. This sort of fits into the presentation aspect of it which was another advantage of the workshop. Elementary teachers take it almost as second nature to display student work and so as soon as I began to display student work for other students it took care of a lot of polishing that I use to be doing. Checking for spelling, making sure it looked neat, those things. I began to post student work and saw a noticeable increase, not an improvement, but more of a commitment. You could say this word is spelled incorrectly and they didn't think of it as anything as other than the teacher helping them to reach the audience. The teacher's role went from evaluator to coach. Now there's a lot of things wrong with that too. Now all of a sudden the shifting hat when you still had to have an evaluation at the end and the evaluation was the bug bear. And I've done my own tests on it, my own kind of research. That is have a group presentation, and then we would have all decided on criteria and we all will have an evaluation sheet. In fact I mark more evaluation sheets then I mark the actual subject. I'll give marks for editing. I won't mark the story, I'll mark the intervening editing. It's very easy to mark. I am no longer now looking at the actual work, but I'm looking at their responses to that work. Kids do not formally do an evaluation sheet on their own work. Much of it is done in groups that groups will evaluate their own work. I come up with a mark that I would give a piece of work out of 20. The criteria is already posted on the board and I 'll just say how many in the class would have given 14. Hands go up, 15, 16 and I find the hands go up on exactly what I would have given. So at some point I just say, "OK, you will evaluate it based on this and I collect all the marks tally them all." We are almost right on, and even those we disagree on kids can respond to it, "Why doesn't it deserve 19? Why does it deserve 17? They've gotten very good at that. So evaluation is put in their hands. And they have to be prepared to redo stuff too. So the whole notion of presentation was one that I thought that the workshop was good for. Then my job went from the challenge of, not how am I going to mark all these papers, but how am I going to design meaningful activities to widen the audience? So we write for everybody, we write for the school newspaper, any writing task I get them to do as well, any real one. We have a newsletter that goes out to parents that kids write for, they write for the school annual, we write for anything we possibly can. We take part in essay contests, enter all the essay contests, enter all the writing contests. My students probably do better than anybody else in the district assessment. That is without question. I also shifted what I look for in a topic too. If I am teaching a short story, before I use to say, "Well, in an essay write the characteristics in a short story or whatever." Now I tend to, "Write in the style of a story, or write a story that this story made you think of, create a character like a character in the story." So there are much more extensions, rather than an evaluation of it. And presenting, presenting, presenting. And I have done all kinds of short assignments that are easily displayed and easily read. They do long pieces of work but that just basically goes in the writing folders or it gets posted, but who has time to read it! Combine art work with writing. In Consumer Ed we extend writing to business letters, writing resumes, complaint letters, posters of all kinds.

Interviewer:
Quite often when new methods are introduced they don't take into account the realities of the classroom. Did you encounter any problems when you tried first using the process.?

Ian:
It slid right in. I learned about sentence combining one day and the very next day tried sentence combining. Very seldom did anything fail because I thought about it ahead of time before I implemented. I also had a tree to fit it to all along. So it wasn't like--here's a strategy try it--I knew exactly where to do it how to fit it in. Not blowing my own horn but it just clicked in. I read and write all the time myself so I think I am a pretty proficient user of the language. So when I started sentence combining I would--in fact it is one strategy I learned at the workshop and no longer use--ake somebody else's writing and ask kids to edit it. Now I'd rather they just extend their own ideas with greater complexity. That I think is a diagnostic tool that was probably all right initially but I soon dropped it. I would say the workshops were still chaotic, I would probably describe my classes when I went back the year after as somewhat chaotic. I never permitted kids to be off task, but it would be much louder than it ever was before. Now it is much more controlled. Kids know exactly what they are expected to do. I don't teach grade 8 so by the time they get to me they already know when they have been in enough classes where kids are working and what they are expected to do. I have no qualms of stopping a class and saying now we will do a little exercise on this. So there's nothing I don't use. Lecturing to free form, but I know exactly how, where, and when. I have become much more aware of talking to learn, writing to learn, listening to learn and I can now actually integrate teaching with all those strategies.

Interviewer:
When you started implementing these things you learned about there were there any problems?

Ian:

No, I went in with something when I went to try whatever in class, I was committed to that. I just had to figure out where and when it fitted in. So things like journal writing, expressive writing, which I had already been using, I sort of knew where and when to fit in. I use the journal much more now for content areas as a writing log rather than a journal in an English class. I have so many ideas about how to generate writing that I really don't need to force everybody to write expressively. Kids are writing all the time anyway, so I haven't in the last couple of years ever demanded a journal. But I'll stop and we'll have five minutes of writing after we had a lot of input in Socials or Consumer Education class and its much less writing as therapy, as writing to learn. They can write themselves towards understanding. I found the process approach created some real difficulties and that was the evaluation.

I think about consensus, cooperative learning, student-centred approaches to learning, not just writing as a process. So I don't even get hung up with, "Oh, is this a prewriting strategy?" Many times the whole process overlaps so much that you can be teaching prewriting at an end stage. You know, taking a piece of work and saying, "Ok, you need to do some rethinking about this aspect of it." So what I found--there were a lot of things--is that one of them is the notion of evaluation. That no one was directing any attention towards the whole philosophy was diametrically opposed to that is evaluation. I began to give marks for the kind of behavior I wanted as opposed to just the writing aspect of it. I wanted cooperative behavior, then I began to reward it with marks. If I wanted increased attention to editing then that's where I began to award the marks. Nobody else came up with that. I remember many times I'd say this has become a problem for me, and they'd say, "Oh don't be silly. Just mark it." They didn't understand that the process approach was opposed to the model of evaluating that we still had.

Interviewer:

Do you think the workshop had any effect on you?

Ian:
Oh yes, I think it was a catalyst for the change. Right after the workshop I embarked on a M.A. I dropped out; I took two courses. What I found, mind wasn't following the methodology. I thought I was doing much better work in my classroom. I also didn't like the research. There was a scientific model for research that I think just didn't work. They were applying a scientific model to counting t-units!

Interviewer:
So basically the workshop was a catalyst for change for you. Was it a combination of ideas and people?

Ian:
Yes. There was also for me the group commitment in the writing committee so this was like part of a much larger inservice for me so this wasn't a one shot thing. We went back to the committee and tried all of these things, and then had an opportunity to follow up. So that the process that was already in place supported what went on in the workshop. That's why I said it was difficult for me to complete your questionnaire--about brainstorming--when I may have learned the strategy somewhere and it got implemented. Actually it was the discussions about it later with all the other people. So the workshop fit in for me differently from the way it did for other people, I'm sure.

Interviewer:
If you didn't have all those support things, the committee people to talk to, do you think it would have been very much different?

Ian:
For me, here I was committed to this--and all of a sudden--actually it was Irene who acted as the biggest catalyst. I remember the day she came and said, "Fill this out, it's an application to be on the Written Expression Committee," and it was that point that I sort of felt carried along. In very short time I had read James Britton book and the next thing I knew I was sitting down to lunch with him. So at some point it was all meant to occur.

Interviewer:
Is there anything you would like to add or are there any questions you might have?

Ian:
I just don't like the whole anonymity of the questionnaire. These have been fairly hard won ideas and its been a difficult fight. Many times I was seen as a maverick in the district. A lot of the ideas I had to argue over, and fight for, and only my consistency has lent it some credibility--I preached the same line for so long. I hate to go under sort of a pseudonym. I would rather Ian said this. But that just may be my egocentric nature.

Interviewer:
What do you think is the most valuable thing that your kids learn from all this?

Ian:
I think that language is empowering. I think, if nothing else, that it's no longer just writing. It's the whole notion of language. The more you do, and the more you practice, and the more you rethink, the more you are empowered. Knowledge is power, language is power. The process is empowering. The end result of process approach is a student who is empowered, is committed to his own learning. He's a risk taker, is a much more flexible thinker, more tolerant of other's views, more understanding how his own initiative can be melded with a group goal. When kids were sitting in nice neat rows taking words from the teachers what they learned was to be polite, to be punctual, and to be passive. This is a much more active, meaningful role of the student in his own learning. I would imagine that if you were sitting in a desk and you were taking orders after a while you would certainly understand that was your role. When you have responsibility for group dynamics, responsibility for dealing with your own personal experiences and bringing them forth, and when you also understand that learning is a constant modification of your own ideas, the end result can't help but

be somebody who is a thinking human being. The minute you get a thinker you've got one who is socially conscious especially, if you are thinking beyond yourself. Writing can do that. Writing will give you a perspective on your own actions, a detached perspective probably. My goal is certainly not to create published authors. If so I would be a failure. But if the goal is to create people who can write in order to expand their own awareness of themselves and their awareness of the world, then I'm very successful.

Appendix F

Detailed Tables of Quetionnaire Results

Table 11
Specific Prewriting Strategies Both Groups Aware of and Where Learned

Prewriting Strategies	Non-Implementers N=4		Implementers N=4	
	Wkshp	Elsewhere	Wkshp	Elsewhere
From Questionnaire				
Brainstorming	1	3		4
Listing	1	3		4
Conferencing	1	2	3	1
Models	1	2	2	2
Networking	2		1	1
Research		2	2	2
Group work		4		4
Added to Questionnaire				
Visual--Film		1		
Personal experience		1		
Mapping or webbing		1		1
Outlining		1		
Interviewing		1		
P.M.I.				1
Synectic				1
Visualization				1
Editing				1
Response to a piece of literature				1
Newspaper item				1
Provision of opening sentence				1
Provision of closing sentence				1
Looping			1	
Prewriting Totals	6	21	9	27

Tables 11, 12, and 13 present the number of non-implementers and implementers aware of specific prewriting strategies, drafting strategies, and revision strategies respectively, and whether specific strategies were learned at the workshop or elsewhere, and the total numbers of strategies learned at the workshop and elsewhere.

Table 12
Specific Drafting Strategies Both Groups Aware of and Where Learned

B. Drafting Strategies	Non-Implementers N=4		Implementers N=3	
	Wkshp	Else-where	Wkshp	Else-where
1. From Questionnaire				
Listing		2		3
Outlining		3		3
Notes		3		2
Idea hordes	2		1	
Focus		3	1	1
Point of view		3	1	1
Drafting Totals	2	14	3	10

Table 13
Specific Revision Strategies Both Groups Aware of and Where Learned

C. Revision Strategies	Non-Implementers N=2		Implementers N=2	
	Wkshp	Else-where	Wkshp	Else-where
1. From Questionnaire				
Assignment rewrites		2		2
Sentence rewrites		2	1	2
Checking for student markers	1	1	1	
Rhetorical revisions		2		1
Error analysis		2		1
2. Added to Questionnaire				
Peer group editing			1	
Revision Totals	1	9	3	6

Table 14 displays the prewriting, drafting, and revision strategies which non-implementers and implementers indicated they needed more information about than was provided in the workshop.

Table 14
Writing Strategies For Which Both Groups Required More Information

	Non-Implementers N=1	Implementers N=1
Prewriting Strategies	conferencing, networking (Ned)	I'd like more research on synectics and new material e.g., creative problem solving (Ivy)
Drafting Strategies	point of view--always a difficult idea for junior students to grasp and, once understood, to sustain (Ned)	
Revision Strategies	As I recall, few if any, specific techniques for revising were offered at the workshop; re-writing as stressed, but various techniques were not detailed. (Ned)	

Tables 15, 16, and 17 display the number of non-implementers and implementers who indicated they: a) did not use, b) are still using, or c) are no longer using specific prewriting, drafting, and revision strategies respectively, as well as, totals for level of use.

Table 15
Level of Use of Prewriting Strategies

Prewriting Strategies	Non-Implementers N=4			Implementers N=4		
	did not use	still using	no longer using	did not use	still using	no longer using
From Questionnaire						
Brainstorming		4			4	
Listing		4			4	
Conferencing		2	1		4	
Models		3			3	1
Networking			1		2	
Research		2			4	
Group work		2	2		4	
Added to Questionnaire						
Visual--Film		1				
Personal experience		1				
Mapping or webbing		1			1	
Outlining		1				
Interviewing		1				
P.M.I.					1	
Synectic					1	
Visualization					1	
Editing					1	
Response to a piece of literature					1	
Newspaper item					1	
Provision of opening sentence					1	
Provision of closing sentence					1	
Looping				1		
Prewriting Totals	0	22	4	1	34	1

Table 16
Level of Use of Drafting Strategies

Drafting Strategies	**Non-Implementers N=4**			**Implementers N=3**		
	did not use	still using	no longer using	did not use	still using	no longer using
From Questionnaire						
Listing	1	2			2	
Outlining	1	3		1	2	
Notes	1	2			2	
Idea hordes	1	2			2	
Focus	1	3			2	
Point of view	1	3			1	
Drafting Totals	6	15	0	1	11	0

Table 17
Level of Use of Revision Strategies

Revision Strategies	**Non-Implementers N=2**			**Implementers N=3**		
	did not use	still using	no longer using	did not use	still using	no longer using
From Questionnaire						
Assignment rewrites		2			2	
Sentence rewrites		2		1	1	1
Checking for student markers		2			1	
Rhetorical revisions		2			1	
Error analysis		2				
Added to Questionnaire						
Peer group editing					1	
Revision Totals		10		1	7	1